

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Conrad Newman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1789. A bill to provide for the payment of \$20,000 to Clarence Leason Rounds, administrator of the estates of Gerald Rounds, deceased; Richard Gray, deceased; Virginia Grafton, deceased; and Geraldine Titus, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1791. A bill to alter the service record of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of the White Van Line, Inc., of South Bend, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1793. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Micker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Saldana Agosto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1798. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Theodore R. Flohl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 1802 (by request). A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Weber; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

37. By Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress in relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

38. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition signed by women of Waterloo, Iowa, protesting the ruling of the War Labor Board declaring the brewery industry essential to the war effort and protesting any form of peacetime conscription of youth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. By the Speaker: Petition of the Insular League of Parent Teacher Associations of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the requested liquidation of the colonial system of government in Puerto Rico, and the right of Puerto Ricans to adopt their own form of government; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1945

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite in power and wisdom, we make our approach this day as servants of the Lord Most High. We recognize with thanksgiving Thy claims upon us through the blessings of Thy providence and in the light of Thy great mercy. We would live and move where the nobler elements of life are at the fore, where the voice of life's higher values is distinctly heard, where human wisdom is subject in fellowship to the mind of God.

May the decisions amid the labors and responsibilities of this day be in right perspective in the lives of these Thy servants and of all related bodies of our Government. We would recognize as our chief task in life our part in the building of a better world. In this endeavor, we sense the need of God's creative touch, of His cleansing grace, of His guiding wisdom, and of His uplifting power.

We commit to our Father's care all who are this day in jeopardy by war's destructive agency. We bespeak for them the embrace of Thy strong, pure, and affectionate nature amid the challenges and perils of this hour of crisis and of destiny.

We commend to Thy fatherly care the family of the Secretary of the Senate, whose death brings to a close a life of great faithfulness in this body. Be gracious unto his colleagues in their loss, we pray.

In the name of the saving Christ and for the glory of God we make our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DEATH OF EDWIN A. HALSEY, SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the untimely death of Edwin A. Halsey, the Secretary of the Senate, is a great shock and a deep personal distress to me, as I know it is to every Member of the Senate. Ed Halsey had the respect, the admiration, and the personal affection, and complete confidence of every Member of the Senate of both political parties.

He was the nephew of John W. Daniel, one of the greatest Senators in the history of Virginia. He was born at Tye River, Nelson County, Va., on September 4, 1881. He has never ceased to take a deep interest in all the affairs of Virginia. He was beloved and respected all through Virginia, as he was in the United States Senate.

He came to the Senate as a page nearly 48 years ago, and from that time to this was in intimate personal contact with the Members of the Senate, a record which I do not believe is paralleled in our history. With great tact, wisdom, and courage, he has at all times upheld the dignity and honor of the Senate. In speaking for both of the present Senators from Virginia, Senator GLASS and myself, I wish to express our deep sense of personal loss and our highest estimate of his public service. The loss to the Senate itself is irreparable, but to the people of Virginia it is the more personal loss of a real friend.

He was elected Secretary of the Senate on March 9, 1933, and has served in that important office until now, rendering a service of most complete satisfaction and usefulness. He performed all the duties assigned to him with the utmost efficiency and with complete impartiality. He had charge, in large measure, of the inaugural ceremonies at the White House on January 20 last. As chairman of the Inaugural Committee, time and time again when I saw the strain upon him in the performance of this duty, in addition to the others he had, I urged him, on account of his recent illness, to conserve his health, but he would not spare himself in performing the duties assigned to him.

I know that many Members of the Senate will desire to pay tribute to his memory—to express their deep affection and admiration for him and for his record of great public service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is with a degree of sorrow and regret which it is wholly impossible to express that I have learned of Colonel Halsey's sudden and untimely death. He was with us in the full vigor of his splendid powers when last the Senate met. Now he treads the valley of the shadow and has been gathered to his fathers.

It would be impossible for me to imagine a more totally competent Secretary of the Senate than Colonel Halsey has been for many years. Indeed, his whole life has been a devoted consecration to efficient public service.

It would be equally impossible, Mr. President, for me to imagine a finer personal character or a more generous friend. Although he was an earnest partisan, he never for an instant failed to be the servant of all the Senate. Republicans as well as Democrats were always the unfailing beneficiaries of his constant courtesies and his superb capacities. He admitted us not only to his great office but also to his great heart.

We shall deeply miss and mourn this able Senate executive, this sterling public servant, this magnificent American, this priceless friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in their expressions of regret over the death and loss of Colonel Halsey. I wish to join with them in their words of tribute to his memory and appreciation of his character and great ability. He entered the service of the Senate in 1897, nearly 48 years ago, as

a page. Through the years he worked up from one place to another until finally he held the great distinction and position of Secretary of the Senate. Forty-eight years of loyal, devoted, faithful service Colonel Halsey gave to the Senate and to his country. He not only performed the duties of his office of Secretary of the Senate but he assumed many additional duties in order that he might better help the Senate in its work and be of never-failing assistance to the individual Members of the Senate in the performance of their duties.

He made countless contributions of great and lasting value to the work of this body. He did much to assist the individual Members of the Senate. It is difficult to conceive how the Senate could have had a more thoughtful, a more faithful, a more indefatigable servant than it had in Colonel Halsey. He was the friend of each and every Member of the Senate, always with outstretched hand, endeavoring to lift some of the burdens resting upon the shoulders of Senators, seeking at all times to be worth while to the Senate and to its Members. He contributed greatly to the accomplishments of the Senate.

We shall sorely miss Colonel Halsey, Mr. President. We shall sorely miss his contributions through the passing days and years. His untimely death is not only a great loss to the Senate, but a great loss to the Nation, which he loved so well.

I know that I express the sentiments of all the Members of this body when I say that we extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Halsey, to their splendid son, and to the other members of the family.

Today, as Colonel Halsey leaves us, we can well and truly say, out of the depths of our hearts, in warm affection for him and deep appreciation of what he has accomplished—"Well done, Ed, thou hast been a good and faithful servant."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, my acquaintance with Colonel Halsey began more than 45 years ago. I came to Washington as assistant clerk to the Committee on Commerce of this body in October 1899. Colonel Halsey was then an employee of the Senate. In all the years that have passed he has served in varied capacities, with loyalty and ability, his party, his State, the Senate, and the Nation.

Colonel Halsey was faithful and efficient always. He was gracious, courteous, kindly. I have lost a friend.

"He is my friend," I said,

* * * * *

And lo! the thought of him
Smiles on my heart—and then
The sun shone out again.

I shall always miss the sound of his voice that is still, the touch of his vanished hand. But, Mr. President, his virtues, the warmth of his friendship, and his character, will live in my memory throughout all the days of my life.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the great sense of sorrow and loss which we all feel, and which in particular the Republican conference of the United States Senate feels, will be expressed in a formal way by resolutions to be submitted

to the Senate by a committee consisting of the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself. I do not know on what day these resolutions will be presented, but probably at the earliest convenient session of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, like the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], I first became acquainted with Colonel Halsey when I also was an employee of the Senate. It was in 1917, when I was serving as secretary to my predecessor, the late Senator Kendrick, of Wyoming, that I first met Colonel Halsey. He was not at that time the Secretary of the Senate; he was occupying another post of responsibility upon this floor.

I can say that those qualities in Colonel Halsey which the distinguished Senators who have spoken this morning have mentioned were quite apparent then. Ever gracious and understanding, he was ready always to meet and to extend to the secretaries and other employees of Senators every aid and assistance which throughout his service as Secretary of this body Senators have found him so ready to extend to us.

He was fair, he was able, he was loyal. He had a broad and intimate knowledge of the history of this body. He was jealous of the honor and the dignity of the Senate. It is difficult for me to believe that we shall easily find a person to measure up to his qualities or to the standard of public service which he established. No burden was too great for him to assume. No request from a Senator, however simple, was ever neglected at his hands.

Mr. President, I speak as one who has lost a friend. I have known Colonel Halsey for almost 30 years. Certainly no man could have given more of himself than did he to the performance of his public duty. It was in truth and in fact his devotion to duty, when he might have been taking care of his health, that brought about his untimely end. His death is a great loss to this body and to all who knew him.

My deepest sympathy goes out to the members of his family, whom he cherished with unalloyed love and devotion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as far back as 1917, I was an employee of this body, and it was at that time that I first met our lamented friend, Edwin Halsey. He had a responsible position in the Senate at that time, which he filled well, and he has continued to perform efficiently every official duty this body has entrusted to him.

I felt that I knew Colonel Halsey well, first as a fellow employee, and later as a Senator. The Senate has lost a very fine public servant. His devotion to duty and unremitting efforts to be of assistance to the Members of this body were, I venture to say, contributing causes to his early passing. We shall all miss him. He was a friend to us all.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my acquaintance with Secretary Halsey began 6 years ago, when I became a Member of the Senate. There is an aisle in the Senate which divides those who hold

different partisan views. Colonel Halsey was the nominee and the choice of Senators on the majority side, as Secretary of the Senate. Notwithstanding that fact, in my 6 years of service in the Senate I never saw Colonel Halsey make the slightest distinction, either in his personal service as Secretary or in the work of the Secretary's office, between Senators upon one side of the aisle and those upon the other. This comment applies also to the personal touch which all of us have with the Secretary's office. There never was the slightest distinction between Senators on the majority side, whose nominee and choice he was, and those of us on the minority side.

Col. Edwin Halsey was a most perfect gentleman. I fear we shall not soon look upon his like again.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I have known Colonel Halsey ever since 1917. In all that time I have known him intimately, and with the passing years I grew to appreciate the man more and more. By his courtesy, his friendliness, his willingness to do a service for a friend, and to carry out the duties of Secretary of the Senate, he set an example as an efficient and able official.

Eddie Halsey in my opinion would have been here now if it had not been for his sense of duty. He kept on working many nights when really he should have gone home. His death has created a void in the Senate, but by his character and adherence to duty he has given us a memory of a truly fine public servant.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in January 1937 when the late great Senator Joseph T. Robinson, the majority leader in the Democratic caucus, nominated Colonel Halsey, he made a comment which I have never forgotten. He said, "And now I am going to speak of the best public servant I ever knew, Col. Edwin A. Halsey."

My experience has taught me the correctness of the words that Senator Robinson uttered about Colonel Halsey. He not only spent his life in, but as the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] has said, he gave his life to the Senate. Efficient, faithful, loyal, he was a part of the Senate as perhaps few who are not of its membership will ever be able to be. He loved the Senate and the Senators as the Senators loved him. He will leave behind a memory of public service which will be an example to us all, a challenge to his successor, and something which will ever tug at the heartstrings of those whom he has left behind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, little did I think as I saw Col. Edwin A. Halsey in the performance of his duties at the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States that that would be the last time I would look at this good man in the living flesh. When I learned this morning that this faithful public servant for all these years in the United States Senate had passed to the Great Beyond, to say that I was shocked, is putting it mildly indeed.

When I came to the Senate of the United States 6 years ago one of the first men I met was Col. Edwin A. Hal-

sey. From that hour until his death Colonel Halsey was my close and personal friend. In my early days in the Senate I went to him for counsel and advice in connection with my duties as United States Senator. He gave it honestly and freely. He was truly a conscientious man. I found that the counsel and the advice he tendered was of immeasurable value in smoothing my path as I moved along from week to week and year to year in this old historic Chamber.

Mr. President, every sigh of the whispering wind brings death somewhere, but in this world of tears and trouble it grieves us all the more when one so close, so dear, and so faithful has been taken from our midst. As has been said by many Members of the Senate, his death is an untimely one. Certainly that statement will never be challenged by the Members of the United States Senate or any friend who knew this man. But, Mr. President, Almighty God in His infinite wisdom plays no favorites in this hazardous game of life. In the words of the poet—

There is a reaper whose name is Death,
And with his sickle keen
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath,
And the flowers that grow between.

With deep reverence and a sad heart I extend my lasting sympathy to the devoted and lovely family of Colonel Halsey. May they take solace and comfort in knowing that he leaves behind thousands upon thousands of true and loyal friends who shall forever revere his memory.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was shocked and distressed this morning to learn of the passing of one of my dearest friends, Colonel Halsey. As one of the younger Members of this body, I can only add to what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has just said that many of the younger Senators have benefited through Colonel Halsey's kindness, his generosity, his big heart, and sound advice; and I know that in this body, as has previously been said, he made no distinction between Senators, no distinction between parties.

Mr. President, I have known Colonel Halsey in this body only a comparatively short time, but before then I knew him in the Democratic conventions held in Chicago in 1932, in Philadelphia in 1936, and in Chicago in 1940. At each of those conventions he was sergeant-at-arms to which office he had first been elected by the Democratic National Committee in July 1928, to serve at the national convention held in Houston, Tex. in that year. At many previous Democratic national conventions, beginning almost with the turn of the century, he had served in connection with the press. It is needless to say that in these assignments the same fidelity to duty and ability distinguished him as during the years when he was Secretary of the Senate.

Colonel Halsey rendered yeoman service to the Democratic Party.

We have lost a close and dear friend, and the Democratic Party one of its stalwart and most helpful supporters. When our distinguished friend, the Secretary of the Senate, resigned as ser-

geant-at-arms last summer, the Democratic National Committee lost one who had made the work of the conventions at times a pleasure, and who had steered us in the right line during the turmoil and struggle of the conventions. Today, in his death, we lose one we cannot replace. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his bereaved family.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, Colonel Halsey devoted his life to the service of his country. He died in that service. He died by reason of that service. Through forty-odd years he was a faithful employee of the United States Senate. Through forty-odd years he was the sympathetic friend of every Senator who sat in this body. We mourn his death. His loss is irreparable.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without saying a word about one of the best and finest friends I ever had. I have known Ed Halsey for more than 30 years. I never knew a more courteous or more kindly gentleman. He was a gentleman on all occasions. He was a gentleman of the old school. I never knew him to do an ungentlemanly act or utter an ungentlemanly word. I think he was one of the finest and noblest characters I have ever known. I do not think I have ever known a man who was more unselfishly friendly. During my whole experience in the Senate I knew always that there was one man in the employ of the Senate who was my friend, who thought of and helped me with my problems. I sincerely mourn his loss. He was a close and intimate friend for 30 years. I was devoted to him. It almost breaks my heart to think of a man like Ed Halsey being taken away in the very prime of life and in the very fullness of his great powers.

As has been stated by other Senators, he was a most capable, efficient, and faithful servant of this body. He was courteous to everyone. No more lovable, more delightful, or finer character was ever connected with this body.

My deepest sympathy goes to his wife and son and other members of his family. They have indeed experienced a great loss; the Senate has suffered a great loss; and the Nation has sustained a great loss.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the tributes which have been paid to our departed and devoted friend. I wish also to join in extending sympathy to his widow and son.

I have not known Colonel Halsey as long as many of you have known him. In the brief time I have served here it has been my pleasure to be associated with him in the bonds of a fine friendship and to receive the benefit of his wisdom, counsel, and guidance in connection with the performance of many of my duties as a United States Senator. I think I can say that I have never had that relationship with one who was more kind, more generous, or more courteous in the service that he rendered to the United States Senate and to individual Members of the Senate. He was always alert, diligent, and conscientious. His loyalty as a friend endeared him to all of us.

He was cooperative and most considerate of us as he helped us to meet intelligently and courageously our responsibilities here. At all times he was bending his efforts, to the maximum of his strength, to perform fully and ably his duties as a public servant. I shall miss him. His death is a great loss, not only to this body, but to the country. At this hour I feel that another great soldier of my country has given the full measure of devotion in public service, and made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I was genuinely distressed this morning when the news came of the passing of Colonel Halsey. I shall always remember his kind and considerate attitude toward me and the other Senators who entered this body 2 years ago. I am sure that my sentiments are shared by other Members who have lately come to the Senate.

Colonel Halsey was strong and devout in his party's beliefs, yet his high sense of fairness was never clouded by partisan feeling. He was helpful to all of us, and particularly helpful to those of us who were newer Members of this body. Not only has the Senate of the United States lost a splendid officer, but each of us has lost a good friend and the country has lost a great public servant.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, even before I came to the Senate, shortly after my election to this body, I received a letter from Colonel Halsey, who then occupied the position of an assistant on this floor. After I entered the Senate, my relations with him were always pleasant. He was a gentleman. He had all the attributes of a gentleman. He was kindly, polite, considerate, and a wise adviser, especially to the younger Members of this body.

Mr. President, one particularly commendable quality in his life and character was his long personal and intimate knowledge of the Senate itself. He studied the history of this body. He was intensely loyal to the Senate. He had a deep appreciation of the high traditions and lofty standards of the American Senate. Oftentimes he spoke to me of those standards and traditions. Oftentimes he recalled the things that he himself had experienced, that he himself had witnessed, that he himself had known personally in connection with the work of this body.

He was a loyal party man; but, as has been so truthfully said by Senators on the other side of the aisle, as an officer of the Senate he did not carry his partisanship into the discharge of his official duties. I found him always to be a wise man. He possessed a wisdom that was born of his long experience here and the observations which he made, as well as his natural good ability and his fine instincts and attributes as a gentleman. He was of great service here. He tried always to be of service to this body. He was always conscious of the finer and better traditions of the Senate, and he carried that consciousness into his private life and into his associations with men in the ordinary, daily affairs of life.

We have had many faithful servants of this body. I can think of many of them who have already gone on. We

shall have yet other faithful servants. But it is to be doubted whether we shall find a man who possesses all the fine qualities of courtesy and gentleness and the spirit of helpfulness and the disposition to do for the Members of this body in the high degree in which they were combined in Colonel Halsey; and at this time in our life, at this time in the affairs of this Nation and of the world, it would be difficult to find another officer who held in such high and reverent esteem the responsibilities of this body, and who loved the better traditions which have made the Senate of the United States great among the parliaments of the world.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing a brief word of regret and sorrow at the passing of Colonel Halsey. From the very first day of my service in the Senate Colonel Halsey made a special effort to be friendly and helpful to a freshman who did not know his way around. He continued that effort during all the time I have been a Member of this body. I feel, Mr. President, that I have lost a personal friend.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce I announce the appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, also as chairman of the Committee on Commerce I announce the appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF UNITED STATES WAR BALLOT COMMISSION

A letter from the United States War Ballot Commission, transmitting, pursuant to the so-called serviceman voting law, the report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements of that Board for the quarter ending March 31, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 451) to authorize the continued operation of certain airport control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration—and relating to

General Mitchell Field, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress in relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use their best efforts to obtain acquiescence in the matter of the will of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in its unanimous desire to have a national cemetery established in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

POST-WAR COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a petition I have received, signed by J. Richard Williams, of Edna, Kans., and nearly 100 other citizens of Mound Valley, Kans., and vicinity.

The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned voters of Kansas, being of the opinion that the May bill pertaining to compulsory military training after the war for all youth reaching the age of 17 years constitutes a national policy of the Nation, and not an emergency measure, and is so radical a departure from all our historic precedents that we can afford to proceed with caution and certainly without haste; therefore we most heartily request that you use your influence to the utmost to persuade Congress to postpone until the war is over any action on the May bill.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I wish to state my position on this and proposed similar legislation. I believe the advice in the petition I have just read—to postpone, until we have some sort of an idea what the post-war world is like, any decision on either compulsory military training or compulsory military service in peacetime—is sound.

I have not definitely decided how I shall vote on the bill providing for compulsory military training in peacetime. But if the measure calls for compulsory military service in peacetime—in other words for peacetime conscription into the military service at home and abroad—I would say I would vote against it.

The allocation of fighting troops from the United Nations on the western front in Europe this winter does not encourage me to support an international policing program for which we would conscript our boys as fast as they reach the age of 17 or 18.

I present the petition for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—MEMORIAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD and appropriately referred as a part of my remarks, without the signatures attached, a memorial signed by 86 citizens of Wichita, Kans., mostly cattlemen, opposing the confirmation of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and head of the R. F. C. The memorial was sent to me by Ludvig Nelson, a prominent citizen of Kansas.

There being no objection, the memorial, without the signatures attached, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CLYDE M. REED,

Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens of Kansas, sincerely ask you to oppose the confirmation of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and R. F. C.

(Signed by 86 citizens of Wichita, Kans.)

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF AIRPLANE CRASHES

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 61), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 9, 1940; Senate Resolution 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 28, 1941; and Senate Resolution 60, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 4, 1943 (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures thereunder is hereby increased by \$15,000. In addition to authority conferred in such resolutions, the committee is authorized to investigate all airplane crashes in air commerce.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM POLICY

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 36) continuing the Special Committee on Petroleum Policy reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 13, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 417. A bill subjecting to assessment by local drainage districts in the State of Oregon lands acquired by the United States for military purposes and lying within the territorial areas of said districts, and making such assessments liens upon said lands and

providing for the payment by the United States of such assessment liens; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 418. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I introduce a bill entitled "A bill to forgive one-half of the unforgiven portion of the individual income tax for 1942."

I am advised that a similar bill will be introduced in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 419. A bill to forgive one-half of the unforgiven portion of the individual income tax for 1942; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 420. A bill relating to appointments to certain offices and positions in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 421. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 422. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 423. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service provided for by the act of December 17, 1943; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 424. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 425. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines caused to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution providing for the observance of October 11, 1945, as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 334) for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE PRODUCTION, ETC., OF FUELS IN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I submit a resolution continuing the authority of the committee instituted under Resolu-

tion 319 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The resolution requests continuation of the authority for the investigation of the production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River. I have informally conferred with the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I request that the resolution be referred to that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942 (authorizing an investigation concerning the production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River), and continued by Senate Resolution 61, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 4, 1943, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, to July 1, 1945.

SURVEY OF THE DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF HEALTH PERSONNEL, ETC.

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, as agreed to June 2, 1940 (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services) is hereby further continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Resolved further, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services) agreed to June 2, 1943, is hereby increased by \$25,000.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR—LETTERS TO SENATOR BUTLER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have not often requested the privilege of having printed in the RECORD any letters which have come to me. However, I have received this morning a letter from a former Governor of my State relative to the drafting of farm labor. I think the letter states very well the situation in the agricultural areas of the country, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY THE WAY RANCH,

Valentine, Nebr., January 25, 1945.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Congressman CARL T. CURTIS,
Congressman HOWARD BUFFETT,
Congressman KARL STEFAN,
Congressman A. L. MILLER:

The selective-service situation with reference to farms and ranches is serious, and if carried out as has now been directed by State authorities in Nebraska it will come near to denuding agriculture of young and capable help. According to their statement there are approximately 10,000 men on farms between the ages of 16 and 25. One-half of these are to be taken. Heretofore they were

in deferred classifications. Already a great many of them have been selected, and have gone or will be going within the next 30 days.

These young men are essential in food production entirely out of proportion to their numbers. They can and do work long hours, under all conditions, whereas older men cannot do that, and in cases where they are the only help in addition to an older man on a farm or ranch it means that production will be greatly reduced when they are gone.

I have in mind a farmer who last year produced about 400 hogs, and operates around 400 acres, as I recall. His last boy has been taken, and he told me that this year he would produce less than 100. Meanwhile there is a shortage of pork. The reduction of hogs in this State for the past year is 39 percent, and 100,000,000 bushels of corn lies on the ground, much of which will spoil unless it is fed up or cribbed.

There is no replacement help available. Those that might be able and willing to work go into war industries for shorter hours, higher pay, and easier conditions of working and living.

Attached is copy of a press release of January 24, 1945, State headquarters, Nebraska selective service. Note the quotation therein of Senator TYDINGS when his amendment to the Selective Service Act was passed by Congress. To me the use of that statement simply dodges the facts. I am not saying that any large section of land will be left uncultivated if these boys are taken. Somebody, somehow will make use of nearly all available land, but production under those conditions will be very, very much less than it would be under proper use. Moreover, it will mean very greatly reduced numbers of livestock, for no farmer or rancher who knows anything about his business or cares anything about it will entrust his animals to inexperienced, unwilling help. I reduced my own herd of cattle very sharply for that reason, and am getting along with one-half of the help I had then, but my contribution to the food supply will be proportionately less.

Farmers or ranchers are having a hard enough time of it as it is keeping their boys at home, for they want to go to war, and many of them are volunteering. The trend now of selective service only accentuates that situation.

The Tydings amendment when it was originally passed and for months afterward relieved the farm-labor situation that had become very acute. Large numbers of farm workers have been taken since then, and the new move to take considerable percentages of those who remain can mean only greatly reduced production of foods and fibers. Increased production during the last 2 or 3 years have not resulted from adequate farm help. Weather has had more to do with it, and no one can tell what the weather will be this year, or any year. If it should be seriously unfavorable the shortage of essential foods could amount to a calamity.

Congress is the only source now of relief. The selective-service boards have been given their instructions, and the majority of them will act accordingly unless they are reassured by the national legislative body.

Thanking you for your attention to this highly important subject, I remain,

Very truly yours,

SAM R. MCKELVIE.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the same subject, I hold in my hand a letter written by a farm wife. Her letter recites in the plainest kind of language the true situation as it exists today on the farms. For the benefit of those who are interested in the subject, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY, NEBR., January 20, 1945.

Senator BUTLER: Once again it seems that another of those grave miscalculations has been made in Washington, D. C.

I feel it my duty to bring this to your attention. Also, if it seems to have the value I think it has, would like to have you bring it to the attention of Senator WHERRY and Senator CAPPER and anyone else who might be interested and understand what I mean.

The agriculture situation cannot be understood by those who are not actually in touch with it at all times and I shall try to tell you what I see happening.

The young men are being taken from the farms now. The idea seems to be that the work can be carried on by older men. The farmer has produced enormous crops the last 2 or 3 years, not because of a great supply of manpower or equipment.

He hasn't told the world how it was accomplished but it's time someone tells.

In our locality every member of the family worked long and hard all year. Through the planting, growing, and harvesting season we worked 7 days per week and long days at that.

These young men who are now being taken from the farms are the ones who drove the tractors and handled the machinery to raise those crops. They worked from daylight till long after dark many nights. They have lights on the machinery so they can work such long hours. Many of them took their noon and evening lunch to the fields with them and never came to the house till they came in to go to bed.

Why did they work like this? Farmers are not so plentiful as they were a few years ago. Many boys were taken from the farms before anything was done about farm deferments. Many families are trying to carry on and do the work they did before some members went to the service. Many farms have grown larger because the land was there to be farmed and no one to farm it, so they expanded.

Any extra farm help absolutely could not be obtained around here last year, much less in the near future. These older men on whom the Government agencies are pinning their hopes could not do the work it would take to keep our farms producing. They lack the skill, the strength, and endurance of our younger farm hands. Many men who are rather elderly and many who are physically handicapped are doing all they can and much more than they should on the farms now.

The things that a farmer must know cannot be told or explained to anyone in a short time. He must learn by experience and by growing up with it. These boys of today who are from 17 years on up, are experienced far beyond what their ages indicate. They had to take over when older brothers went to the service and they have the ability and judgment of mature men. They possess the initiative and ability to understand the new developments and profit by them. In industry the laborer learns to do the one thing which is his duty to the job he has. He does this day after day.

In agriculture we have to learn to operate so many different kinds of machinery, must know how each machine is assembled, what each part does, how to repair and adjust the machinery. He must understand the different kinds of soil, how and when to handle each type of soil. What to plant and how to plant to best advantage. How to recognize and destroy obnoxious weeds. How to adjust each piece of machinery to make it accomplish the task for which it was made. The machinery must be changed on different sizes of crops, different conditions of soil, different types of soil, and different stages of

growth of crops or weeds. Also the farmer must be a fair blacksmith, carpenter, and understand care of livestock as well as the treatment of the farm animals in sickness and emergencies. You can see how impossible it would be to employ one who was inexperienced and accomplish anything, as it would almost be necessary to be with him and show him how, thus taking the time of one experienced man as well as one who was learning how. The person who has not been raised on the farm and does not have the welfare of agriculture in his veins, could not and would not work the long hours and take off so little time as our farm hands do.

Those who have been accustomed to doing this work realize how very necessary it is to care for everything on the farm when it is exactly at the proper stage of development, and they know how a broken piece of machinery can delay the farm operations and what it means in man-hours and machine-hours lost. The experienced farm hand knows just how to handle machinery as to speed and methods to make as few hours lost through breakage and accidents as possible.

It can be seen when one considers the skill and knowledge that a successful farmer must have that he cannot be replaced by three men who do not understand the art of science and who do not have the welfare of the farm in their minds and hearts.

While the boys have been doing the field work the rest of the family have been doing chores, caring for the homestead, helping in the fields where hand work is needed, making and repairing fences, caring for livestock, often making new parts and repairs for machinery, getting the different implements out of storage and ready for work and running the many errands which is a very big job which one can never have completed.

When you take into consideration that many of our farm heads are between the ages of 50 and 75 and the older boys have been taken in the service you can see we can hardly carry on if the rest of our help is taken from the farms. It looks now like there will be much more idle farm ground this coming season than we had last year. Farmers are discussing the situation and county agriculture agents are expecting it.

Next fall will be too late to do anything about it. What could not be planted and cared for this spring and summer can never be reaped in the fall. With the Nation, our servicemen, and many foreign countries to be fed we can't afford to hamper agriculture.

I'm enclosing a clipping from the Beatrice Daily Sun. It is a list of farm sales to be held. This began last August with the heaviest run of sales in the fall I have ever seen. The list has been as long, since early fall, as now, and many days a much longer list, and it will continue until March and longer, if too many farmers are forced to quit because of inability to find help or carry on alone. Think this over and see if we can spare these young men who are really doing one of the grandest jobs of the times and in the face of the greatest handicaps.

Sincerely,

MRS. J. D. SNYDER.

SALE DATES

January 19: Charlie Sykes, 2 miles north and three-fourths of a mile east of Clatonia. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 22: Brunke Schmidt, 2½ miles east of Cortland. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 23: William Paulsen, route 2, Beatrice, Ruyle & Heist, auctioneers.

January 24: Oscar Weichel, 5½ miles west and 1 mile north of Plymouth. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 24: John Parde, 3 miles east, 3 miles south of Pickrell. Ridgley & Ridgley, auctioneers.

January 26: Horse and mule sale at Beatrice Fair Grounds. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 29: John Javorsky, 3 miles west and 1½ miles south of Wilber. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 30: Jim Essam, 2¾ miles south of Davis Confectionery, Beatrice. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 31: Andrew Sorenson, northeast of Filley. Leach & Heist, auctioneers.

February 5: William Richtarik, 7 miles west and 1½ miles south of Wilber. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

February 5: H. D. Pearl, 1 mile south and 3 miles east of Wymore. A. M. Porterfield, auctioneer.

February 6: Rudolph Peters, 1½ miles east of Odell. Elmer Novotny, auctioneer.

February 7: Charles Theye, 1 mile south, one-fourth mile east of Odell. Schultes Bros., auctioneers.

February 12: William Broz, 4 miles north and 1½ miles west of Swanton. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

February 14: Menne Schuster, 9 miles northeast of Beatrice.

February 21: Waldos' purebred Duroc hog sale at DeWitt Sales Pavilion. McMurray & Heist, auctioneers.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, an article written by David Lawrence on the subject of the legal question which has been raised by the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW QUESTION RAISED IN NAMING OF WALLACE—OBSERVER CITES ACT OF CONGRESS BANNING POLITICAL JOB REWARDS

(By David Lawrence)

Did President Roosevelt disregard a law of Congress forbidding political rewards when he sent to the Senate the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator?

The statute referred to became law on August 2, 1939, when it was signed by President Roosevelt. Section 3 reads as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any act of Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election."

This is what President Roosevelt wrote in his letter of January 20, 1945, to Jesse Jones:

"Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

"He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration."

REWARD FOR ACTIVITY

The foregoing reveals that the Office of Secretary of Commerce, which was created

by act of Congress, was bestowed on Henry Wallace as a reward for political activity. Neither the President nor the Vice President are exempted from the provisions of the section in question.

If it is "unlawful" for a President or any other Federal official to give a public office as a political reward, is it lawful for the United States Senate to confirm a man who receives the reward? This is a question which bears on the spirit, if not the letter, of those statutes which have long been looked upon as a means of keeping Government free from pernicious influences. Offenses under not only the Federal Corrupt Practices Act but the Hatch Act are subject to fine and imprisonment if convictions are obtained.

There is nothing in the law which limits the making of the promise to any action taken or promise made during a campaign. The bestowal of a reward after the campaign is apparently as much banned as a promise. For the statute speaks of "reward for any political activity," and this logically could not materialize until after the service is rendered and a campaign concluded and the victor is in a position to award his plums to those who have helped him win.

INTIMIDATION IN WIRE

There has been some intimidation that, even during the campaign—in fact, shortly after the convention was held which nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term but rejected the renomination of Mr. Wallace for Vice President—a telegram was allegedly sent by Mr. Roosevelt to Mr. Wallace bearing on the subject of a promise of future office.

William K. Hutchinson, head of the International News Service in Washington, in a dispatch on Monday of this week, said that after the unsuccessful fight made at the convention Mr. Wallace received a telegram from Mr. Roosevelt purporting to read as follows:

"Tell Mrs. Wallace not to make any move to leave Washington. There will always be a place in my household for you."

Mr. Wallace didn't bolt the ticket, but went ahead to give it his active support. For several weeks there was public speculation last summer and autumn as to what post Mr. Roosevelt might have in mind for the retiring Vice President. This telegram, however, would not be persuasive except in relation to the January 20 letter. The words of the statute which bar any reward for political activity alone need to be considered, in view of the fact that the President now publicly admits that he is giving a public office as a political reward to Mr. Wallace.

IRRIGATION AND NEBRASKA'S FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Irrigation and Nebraska's Future," delivered by him at the first annual convention of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, at Lincoln, Nebr., January 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY ROBERT P. PATTERSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Do We Fight With One Hand Tied, Or With Everything We Have?" written by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

A BANKER WHO SERVES AS A PRIVATE—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article published in the New York Times entitled, "Banker, 48, Serves as Private in Line," referring to Pvt. (1st cl.) Edward J. Arthur, of Union, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

A CITIZEN ARMY—ARTICLE BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN MCAULEY PALMER

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "General Marshall Wants a Citizen Army," written by John McAuley Palmer, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of December 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POST-WAR DEFENSE PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN MCAULEY PALMER

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "How to Solve Our Post-war Defense Problem," written by Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—ARTICLE FROM COLLIER'S WEEKLY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Do We Want National Health Insurance?" by Amy Porter, from Collier's magazine for January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—EDITORIAL FROM KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Brazen Political Pay-off," commenting on the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, published in the Kansas City Star of January 23, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—LETTER TO THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter signed by Benny Austin, relative to the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, and printed in the January 24, 1945, edition of the Washington News, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Forging New Chains," from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of January 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a poem by Horace C. Carlisle in tribute to the late Senator Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of sundry resolutions which I am about to report from that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that, as I understand the situation, the Senator from Illinois desires to have the Senate take action upon a number of resolutions

which he is about to report from the committee of which he is chairman. I believe that in the main, if not entirely so, the resolutions would simply extend until July 1 various committees and agencies which heretofore have been set up by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true with respect to a number of the resolutions. Other resolutions would provide for such continuation for the full session of Congress.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that other resolutions provide for the extension of the life of committees which the Senator and his committee believe should be continued in their activities. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the resolutions, unless they are agreed to today the committees concerned will be without funds the day after tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that to be the situation, and I think that is justification for consideration of the resolutions at this time. I should prefer not to have the extensions made beyond July 1; but on the assurance of the Senator that the subjects dealt with by the resolutions are matters of real importance, and that the committees affected are doing work which should be continued, I shall offer no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Maine.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the resolution (S. Res. 45) submitted by Mr. McMAHON on January 22, 1945, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

HATTIE L. LAMBERT

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the resolution (S. Res. 22) submitted by Mr. BILBO on January 6, 1945, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Hattie L. Lambert, sister of John E. Lambert, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 33, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 33) submitted by Mr. GEORGE on January 15, 1945, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 102, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 12, 1943 (creating the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning), as amended by Senate Resolution 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 16, 1943, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation for the Senate with regard to this very important resolution. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was unanimous in its desire that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning be continued. It was created by the Senate in March 1943 at the instance of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. At that time the Senate appropriated \$50,000 for the use of the committee, and at this moment the unexpended balance is \$20,050.32. I have conferred with the able Senator from Georgia with respect to the continuation of the work of the committee. I am a member of the committee. I am advised that before the end of the year has been reached the hearings will probably be completed, and that a final report will be made. The committee will then probably be dissolved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 33) was considered and agreed to.

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF INSURANCE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG on January 6, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of old-age and survivors insurance, under the Social Security Act, in respect to coverage, benefits, and taxes related thereto. The joint committee shall report to the Congress not later than October 1, 1945, the results of its study

and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

Sec. 2. The joint committee is hereby authorized, in its discretion, to appoint an advisory committee of individuals having special knowledge concerning matters involved in its study and investigation to assist, consult with, and advise the joint committee with respect to such study and investigation. Members of the advisory committee shall not receive any compensation for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in connection with the performance of the work of the advisory committee.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

Sec. 4. The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties under this resolution, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed until the Classification Act of 1923, as amended for comparable duties.

Sec. 5. The expenses of the joint committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE WAR-MOBILIZATION PROBLEMS AND WAR-CONTRACTS MATTERS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably without amendment, Senate Resolution 46, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. President, the resolution provides that the committee shall continue its work until July 1, 1945. The committee was created by the Senate on October 20, 1942. The Senate authorized the committee to expend up to \$15,000. The committee has an unexpended balance of \$2,345.06, and is asking for no further funds. I am advised that the report of the committee will be completed by July 1, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 46) reported by Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs on January 25, instant, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 107 and Senate Resolution 216, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to study the problems of war mobilization; and that the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 198 and Senate Resolution 288, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to investigate war contracts, termination of war contracts, and related problems, be and are hereby continued to July 1, 1945.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF THE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an additional amendment, Senate Resolution 18, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 18) submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on January 6, 1945, which had been previously reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "Seventy-ninth Congress," and insert "Senate from February 1, 1945, until July 1, 1945"; and subsequently reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with additional amendments, in line 7, after the word "continued", to strike out "and may be exercised during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the"; and at the end of the resolution to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941, and Senate Resolution 39, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1943, and Senate Resolution 294, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 23, 1944 (relating to the investigation of the use of public lands), is hereby continued until July 1, 1945; and the limit of expenditures under such resolutions is hereby increased by \$5,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement for the RECORD with regard to Senate Resolution 18, which has been agreed to.

The original resolution was agreed to on May 24, 1940. A sum of \$30,000 was authorized by the Senate to be expended by the committee and at the present time there is an unexpended balance of \$4,582.87. Hearings are now being held under the resolution. Those in charge of the work have advised me that they will be able to complete their work by July 1, 1945, and make a final report at that time.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS BY WIRE AND RADIO—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 24, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 24) submitted by Mr.

McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WHITE) on January 6, 1945, and reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce on January 6, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to October 19, 1943 (providing for an investigation of international communications by wire and radio), as supplemented by Senate Resolution 268, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 29, 1944, is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures of the committee for such purposes is hereby increased by \$10,000.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 31, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 31) submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HATCH) on January 11, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 26, 1943 (relating to an investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power), as amended and supplemented by Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 5, 1944, and Senate Resolution 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to September 5, 1944, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

HOWARD B. SMITH

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 39, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the limit of expenditures contained in Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to December 9, 1943 (authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act), as modified by Senate Resolution 238, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944, there is hereby authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate to Howard B. Smith, the sum of \$2,805 as compensation for stenographic services rendered to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in reporting and transcribing hearings held before such committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I believe that an explanation should be made with respect to the resolution. The resolution involves an obligation which

was incurred with reference to Howard B. Smith, who was the reporter for the committee which proceeded under Senate Resolution No. 197. That resolution had to do with the investigation of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act. The sum of \$7,500 was appropriated on December 9, 1943, to carry on the work of the committee. Of that amount only \$2.01 remains unexpended. I understand that an attorney by the name of Carrol L. Beedy, a former Member of the United States House of Representatives from Maine, was employed as general counsel to the committee. Another gentleman by the name of Glavis was appointed as investigator for the committee. Those two men were fortunate enough to obtain the \$7,500 which had been appropriated for the use of the committee, leaving the reporter to hold the bag. I make that explanation to the Senate because, strictly speaking, there is no legal justification for the payment of the obligation, although the reporter really earned his money. With the exception of the sum which I stated, no money now remains in the fund. It would appear that under the doctrine of preferred creditors, the attorney and the investigator took most of the entire fund.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 39), submitted by Mr. AIKEN on January 22, 1945, was considered and agreed to.

STUDY OF AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 16, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been previously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on line 6, after the word "to", to strike out down to and including the period in line 11, and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the date for submission of the report called for by Senate Resolution 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 30, 1944 (relating to a study into the legal and constitutional authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations), is hereby extended to July 1, 1945.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF STUDY AND SURVEY OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment,

Senate Resolution 28, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. Mr. President, I believe that a brief explanation should be made of the resolution.

The Special Committee to Study and Survey the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises has been in existence since October 8, 1940. The Senate has authorized for the use of the committee the total sum of \$140,000. At the present time there remains an unexpended balance of \$4,596.85, and this resolution seeks an additional appropriation of \$100,000.

While in the opinion of the committee, the sum of money asked for is large, yet the testimony before the committee has demonstrated beyond any question that the committee is performing a great public service in the interest of the small businessmen throughout the Nation.

There is one other fact to which I wish to invite the attention of the Senate, but which is incidental to the appropriation of money. I refer to the number of employees who are engaged by the Small Business Committee. They are employees who have been borrowed from the executive branch of the Government to perform necessary services in connection with the functions of the committee. Some time ago the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted a resolution requesting that all committees report to the Senate the number of employees who were being borrowed from the executive branch of the Government to help in performing the services of special committees of the Senate. That resolution was productive of enlightening information. This is no reflection upon the chairman of any special or standing committee who happens to be following this procedure. This procedure is not a new one; however, I am calling it to the attention of the Senate, for whatever it may be worth in determining whether or not the policy should be continued. The Small Business Committee has a great number of employees. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them, but they come from the Foreign Economic Administration, the War Production Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Department of Commerce, the Office of Price Administration, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the War Department. Those employees are drawing in salaries a total of \$82,200 a year, which is being paid by the executive branch of the Government, although that branch is getting absolutely no service from them. That is just one committee which is doing that. Other committees of the Senate are doing the same thing. The attitude I take—and I take it not as chairman of the committee but rather as a Senator—is that no individual can serve two masters. The Senate of the United States ought to assume its rightful position in connection with employees from the executive branch and ought either to pay them and take them off the pay roll of the executive departments or else send them back to the executive departments where they belong. There is involved a very serious question of policy as to how far the Senate of

the United States should go in taking employees from the executive branch, bringing them here, giving them an office in the Senate Office Building, and using them for legislative purposes. We ought to do one thing or the other, Mr. President. We ought to face this question frankly. If the Small Business Committee needs \$80,000 worth of employees to carry on its functions it should appear before the proper committee and get the money there, rather than to borrow employees from the executive branch of the Government at the other end of the Avenue.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. The Special Committee on the Problems of Small Business is perfectly willing to have the Senate adopt the policy which has just been suggested by the able Senator from Illinois. I want to point out that at the beginning of the activities of the Small Business Committee we were limited by the Senate to a very small amount to carry on the work of the committee, and had it not been for the fact that we were able to procure the assistance which we secured from the various agencies of the Government we would not have been able to have done the work we did for the protection of small business enterprise, in this country. I am sure the Senator from Illinois recognizes that; but I approve of the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois that the Senate should adopt some policy and adhere to it.

I wish to point out further that it will be extremely difficult to secure the character of assistance we have secured from the various agencies of the Government merely by employing help temporarily in connection with the work of the committee because the men whom we have secured from the Government agencies are men of vast experience in the problems which confronted the committee, and if now we go out and try to hire clerks and experts to give the assistance to this committee which it has received in the past it would be very difficult, I am sure, to get that kind of help.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. There was some testimony before our committee the other day that if one of these employees were discharged from the Small Business Committee he would have no right to return to the executive branch, even though he is accredited to that branch; in other words, he would be out of a job. Is that true or not true?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not know of any case of that kind.

Mr. LUCAS. There was one witness who has been working for some committee—

Mr. WHERRY. The Liquor Investigating Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; the Liquor Investigating Committee, who came before

us and said that in the event the investigation of the committee was discontinued, and no funds were appropriated for its continuation, he would be out of a job; that, although he was attached to the Antitrust Division of the Attorney General's office, they would not take him back. I wondered if the same condition applied to employees, for instance, who have been in the service of the Small Business Committee for 2 years or more, and whether they would have the opportunity to go back and continue to work for the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure that every agency of the Government from whom we have borrowed help will be very glad to take back any of the employees we have, because they are all competent, able men, rendering very valuable service to our committee. I wonder how we would be able to get the same kind of help if we were compelled to hire it in the open market. As the employees who come from the Government agencies are under civil service, they have certain rights, whereas if we hired people off the streets to assist the committee, they would not have the same status.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reply to the Senator is simply that if these employees are not needed in the executive branch of the Government, as apparently they are not, the Senate itself ought to take care of them.

Mr. MURRAY. I think they are performing a service for the executive branch of the Government by their work with our committee. For instance, if we have an employee of the War Department or the Navy Department or any other department which has been carrying on the character of work that the committee has been carrying on in its investigation and study, in my opinion, such employee is performing a service for the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. With all due deference to my good friend from Montana, I take the position that an individual who is in the employ of the executive branch of the Government at \$6,000 a year could not be away from that job for 2 years and be of very much value to the executive branch, even though the Government agency still continues to pay him.

I want the Senator thoroughly to understand that I am not attaching any blame to him because he has followed a custom which has become established. I am merely calling it to the attention of the Senate, so that the Senate soon can determine and fix definitely a policy one way or the other with respect to it.

Mr. MURRAY. I am in full accord with the Senator from Illinois. I want to say that the Small Business Committee has rendered a very valuable service to the small businessmen of the country, and the committee would not have been able to do it if it had not been able to secure assistance from various executive departments. When we first started out it was thought that there was no need for such a committee, but when we got into the work and the war production program came on we found that small business was rapidly being extinguished. Through the efforts of this

committee that trend was stopped, and so the committee has done a very valuable piece of work for the country, I think, in saving the small business enterprise.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning the work which has been done by the Senator and his committee; otherwise, we probably would not have provided for the committee an additional hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate that.

Mr. LUCAS. However, if the Senator from Montana or any other Senator who is chairman of a special committee can go to the executive branch of the Government and obtain all the employees he wants in order to carry on effectively the work of his committee, then there is no reason why every special or standing committee of the Senate should not do the same thing. In my opinion, there is no reason why I could not go to the executive branch of the Government and convince them, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, that I need at least six men who are on their pay roll to help me out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with this discussion, a few instances have come to my attention of some of the special committees asking an executive agency to hire certain persons. I believe that is a bad practice. I am in total agreement with the statement made by the Senator from Illinois that if any person is necessary to the conduct of the business of any of these various committees, the Senate itself should provide the funds, and under no conditions should we have to resort to the executive department for aid.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the testimony before some of the special investigating committees showed instances like that of one man who, as I recall, had been on three different pay rolls at different times within 60 days. Am I correct, I ask the Senator from Illinois? Certainly it was within a very short time.

Mr. LUCAS. I have forgotten the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. That leads me to believe that at times unexpended balances are used to transfer employees from one pay roll to another pay roll and then to another pay roll, and the work done under the various pay rolls is not tied together in any way so as to benefit any one activity.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As a new member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I wish to join in the report of the chairman and in the statement he has made with reference to continuing the various committees under the resolutions which have been reported this morning and agreed to.

I wish to state also, with as much force as I possess, that I appreciate the attitude of the committee in approving the appropriation for the Small Business Committee. I happen to be a member of that committee, and I join with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in stating to the membership of the Senate that we need a small business committee of the Senate in order to help the small businessmen throughout the country as various executive agencies issue orders which have a tremendous impact on the distribution and sale of their merchandise. I heartily endorse everything the Senator has said.

I also agree with what has been stated by the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. As I looked at the different proposals pending at the first meeting of the committee, it occurred to me they were conclusive evidence of the need for the adoption of the resolution I presented last August.

I am convinced that the Small Business Committee needs all the personnel it has today in order to do its work. I think it is one of the most important committees of the Senate. I am also of the opinion that if the employees were employed directly, they would be loyal beyond any question. I do not mean to say they are not loyal now; but being employed by a department, to a certain degree they have a loyalty to that department which otherwise they might give to the Senate committee in a study of the problems covered in the investigations.

The junior Senator from Montana appointed me on a subcommittee, together with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If I am correct, we have had about 50 subcommittee investigations, and the subcommittee has done a tremendous amount of work in helping to amend and clarify Executive orders which otherwise cause confusion quite generally clear through the production, the wholesaling, and the retail distribution of the merchandise.

I wish to commend the Senator from Illinois and the committee for the action they have taken. They have served notice on the Senate that it should take notice of this practice, and that we should investigate it. The life of most of the committees has been extended to July 1, and they go before the Committee on Appropriations and establish their justification for an appropriation if they need more employees.

Last August I raised a question about Senate committees borrowing persons from Government agencies and other organizations. Those I had in mind are most often provided by departmental agencies of Senate committees. They are not paid officials of the Senate, and they are not regular employees of the Senate committees.

Almost every Senate committee has at some time had the services of experts and clerical assistants loaned to them by Government departments. Some of these individuals often serve with Senate committees for months at a time. The practice of borrowing Government personnel is a long-standing one. I know

there are many reasons why the practice is continued, and I do not arbitrarily condemn it.

From time to time, however, there are aspects of this practice of borrowing Government agency personnel which have appeared to be highly questionable. In a few instances the practice has gone beyond propriety to the point of an abuse of the principles which should govern the work of Senate committees.

Before questioning any feature of a practice of such long standing, it seemed to me desirable to ascertain some facts about it. What agencies are loaning personnel to Senate committees? How many individuals are loaned out in this manner? What annual rates of pay do they receive? What Senate committees are furnished with this personnel? With knowledge about such facts, we could form a better judgment of the propriety of the practice, and what, if anything, we should do about it.

With that thought in mind, I offered an amendment to Senate Resolution 319 in the following language:

Hereafter standing or select committees employing the services of persons who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof shall submit monthly reports to the Senate (or to the Secretary during a recess or adjournment) showing (1) the name and address of any such person; (2) the name and address of the department or organization by whom his salary is paid; and (3) the annual rate of compensation in each case.

Senate Resolution 319, with this amendment, was agreed to August 23, 1944. Beginning with the end of August and continuing to the present time, monthly reports have been made by standing and special committees, including subcommittees, of persons employed by them who are not regularly employed by the committees or by the Senate itself.

I have observed those reports from time to time as they have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Recently I made a check of the over-all results from the time the resolution was passed up to and including December 31, 1944. The check is, admittedly, a rough one for several reasons. The indexing of the RECORD is not so perfect that it lists each and every one of these committee reports, so I may have missed some, especially those which are not in tabular form. The reports themselves are not all uniform, and that makes an over-all computation difficult. The details of the reports also change from month to month, and there are a few instances of overlapping items.

There is enough about these reports, however, to permit what accountants would call an unadjusted summary of the facts having substantial accuracy. That is what I now wish to place before the Senate.

In the period from the passage of Senate Resolution 319 on August 23 to December 31, 1944, a total of 14 Senate committees reported having borrowed personnel. Of this number 10 are standing committees and their subcommittees.

The number of departments or organizations furnishing personnel to Senate committees totals 26, of which 25 are Government agencies and 1 is a private organization.

The total number of individuals furnished to committees was 97; 95 from

Government agencies and 2 from private sources. The average number of individuals on loan to all committees over each month from August to December was 72. This does not mean that 72 different persons were loaned to committees each month. Many of the same people from the same Government agency serve the same Senate committee month after month. My figure simply means that if we take any single month and make an inventory of borrowed personnel, we will find on the average some 72 individuals from outside agencies at work with Senate committees.

The average total annual rate of pay received by these individuals is \$253,560. In other words, on the average during any month since these reports under Senate Resolution 319 began, there were borrowed by Senate committees 72 individuals whose annual rate of pay totaled \$253,560. Reduced to a simple statistical concept, each month 14 reporting Senate committees are being assisted by an average of 72 outside persons whose average monthly base rate of pay totals \$21,130.

I would have Senators bear in mind the limitations of statistics like these. A Senate committee may borrow a Government expert for a single month. Under the simple reports now being made, the committee would report that one employee, along with others, and list his annual rate of pay at, say, \$6,500. The committee may have him for 1 month only, and never again, but the facts would be reported as I have given them. We shall never know the true state of affairs until committee accounting is improved to the point where every individual serving a committee is actually paid out of the committee funds for the period he serves, whether it is 1 day, 1 week, or a year. Then committee accounts will show the facts in proper form.

Until we have facts reported in accurate form, we can only rely on estimates, averages, and other statistical assumptions. Within these limitations, the figures I have given do reflect the condition of affairs on this question of borrowing Government personnel for service on Senate committees.

I am not ready to offer conclusions on the facts as they appear to date. I think a longer time experience is needed; and I shall want more accurate accounting detail. It may be possible for me to have the General Accounting Office keep track of these reports and tabulate them. Perhaps the Committee on the Reorganization of Congress will take up the problem. Some supervision over the facts will have to be arranged.

I merely wanted to bring such facts as are presently available to the attention of the Senate; and to say that when the picture is more complete, I expect to present an analysis of them and discuss their broader implications.

Mr. President, the practice referred to by the Senator from Illinois is one about which I think the Senate should arrive at a determination, and I wish to join with the chairman of the committee and the committee in the policy they have adopted. I endorse everything they have said. I think the report is timely, and I hope that without objection the exhibit

I have may be printed in the RECORD, showing the conclusions of the investigation, and giving the statistics.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Individuals borrowed for committee service and total annual rates paid

Committees and subcommittees	August		September		October		November		December	
	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay
Appropriations.....	4	\$19,500	4	\$19,500	4	\$19,500	4	\$19,500	4	\$19,500
Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Wartime Health.....	12	33,200	13	38,840	13	38,840	12	37,600	12	37,600
Military Affairs.....	4	15,800	2	7,800	2	7,800	4	15,800	4	15,800
Subcommittee on War Contracts.....	9	29,460	8	31,460	7	19,960	5	20,300	6	22,300
Special Subcommittee on War Mobilization.....	11	38,440	11	39,000	11	39,000	10	37,000	10	37,000
Naval Affairs.....	2	1 + 7,512	2	1 + 7,512	2	1 + 7,512	2	1 + 7,512	2	1 + 7,512
Senate Navy Liaison Office.....	4	2 + 7,104	4	2 + 7,104	4	2 + 7,104	4	2 + 7,104	4	2 + 7,104
Pensions.....	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000
Public Lands and Surveys, Subcommittee to Investigate Public Lands.....	2	7,000	2	7,000	2	7,000	2	7,000	2	7,000
Special committees:										
Post-War Economic Policy and Planning.....	2	3,700	6	23,200	1	43,800				
Investigating the National Defense Program.....			5	23,100	5	23,100	5	23,600	4	17,600
To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprise.....	13	36,400	11	28,800	12	35,300	12	35,300	12	35,300
Senate Small Business Committee.....	10	40,400	11	46,900	11	46,900	11	46,900	12	48,520
Total.....	60	203,316	79	279,576	75	260,816	73	263,856	73	260,236

¹ 1 person, \$162 per month subsistence additional. Also 1 person \$91.50 per month subsistence additional.
² 2 persons, \$132 per month subsistence additional. Also, 2 persons, \$91.50 per month subsistence additional.

³ 1 person, salary unknown. Paid by committee 4 days at \$25 per day, \$100. Not included above.

⁴ 1 person, salary unknown. Paid by committee 4½ days at \$25 per day, \$112.50. Not included above.

⁵ Served 4 days only.

⁶ Reported separately, but occasionally commingled.

Senate committees

Department or organization providing and paying individuals	Appropriations	Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education	Military affairs			Naval affairs		Pensions	Public Lands, Subcommittee to Investigate Public Lands	Special committees				Department or organization totals	Private
			Military Affairs	Subcommittee on War Contracts	Subcommittee on War Mobilization	Naval Affairs	Navy Liaison			Post-war Economic Policy and Planning	Investigate the National Defense Program	To Study Problems of Small Business Enterprise	Senate Small Business Committee		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)		
General Accounting Office.....	2									2				4	
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	1									1				2	
District of Columbia Government.....	1									1				2	
War Production Board.....		1		1	4							8	7	21	
Navy Department.....		4		3		2	4						1	14	
Federal Public Housing Administration.....															
Office of Price Administration.....		2												2	
Federal Security Agency.....		1			2						1	1	2	7	
Veterans Administration.....		3						1						4	
Federal Works Agency.....		1												1	
U. S. Army.....		1									2			3	
U. S. Navy.....		1												1	
War Department.....			5	1										6	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....				2										4	
Smaller War Plants Corporation.....				3										4	
Farm Security Administration.....				1										1	
Foreign Economic Administration.....				1								1	1	3	
Department of Interior.....					2									2	
War Manpower Commission.....					2									2	
National Housing Agency.....					2									2	
Agriculture Department.....									2					2	
Bureau of the Census.....										1				1	
U. S. Maritime Commission.....										1				1	
Department of Commerce.....											2		2	4	
Private: Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C.....												1		1	
Total for each committee.....	4	15	5	12	12	2	4	1	2	7	5	14	13	95	1
														96	

Appropriations Committee
 [KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August to Sept. 1	For [Sept. 30] Oct. [2]	October (Rept. Nov. 1)	November (Dec. 5)	December 1944
1	John F. Feeney.....	General Accounting Office.....	(C. R. 14, p. 7605)	(C. R. 16, p. 8762)	(C. R. 16, p. 8264)	(C. R. 17, p. 8921)	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3)
2	Harold E. Merrick.....	do.....	\$6,400	\$6,400	\$6,400	\$6,400	\$6,400
3	Thomas J. Scott.....	Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
4	Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen.....	District of Columbia government.....	(C. R. 16, p. 8261)				
			3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
Total.....			(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500

Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning

[WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			August	Special	(Sept. 30 and Oct. 2) September	Oct. 31
1	Claire Cahill.....	Bureau of Census.....	(C. R. 14, p. 7604)		(C. R. 16, p. 8262)	(C. R. 16, p. 8264)
2	Miles L. Colean.....	Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C.....	\$3,700		\$3,700.00	
3	John F. Feeney.....	General Accounting Office.....	Not known	\$100	\$112.50	
4	Harold E. Merrick.....	do.....			6,400.00	
5	Thomas J. Scott.....	Federal Bureau of Investigation.....			4,800.00	
6	Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen.....	District of Columbia government.....			4,800.00	
7	Borge Hansen-Moller.....	Treasury Department.....			3,500.00	
	Total.....		(2) 3,700	(1) 100	(6) 23,200.00	(1) 3,800

* 4 days, at \$25 per day.

* 4½ days, at \$25 per day.

* Served 4 days only.

Committee on Education and Labor

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

[CLAUDE PEPPER, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			Sept. 1	As of Oct. 1	As of Nov. 1	As of Dec. 1
1	Lauretta April.....	War Production Board.....	(C. R. 15, p. 8154)	(C. R. 16, p. 8262)	(C. R. 16, p. 8264)	(C. R. 17, p. 8841)
2	Philip C. Curtis.....	Navy Department.....	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$3,200
3	Billy Gene Durham.....	Federal Public Housing Administration.....	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
4	Doris B. Hazur.....	Office of Price Administration.....	1,440	1,440	1,440	1,440
5	Harald Lund.....	Navy Department.....	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
6	Carl Malmberg.....	Federal Security Agency.....	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200
7	Eva Jo Marra.....	Navy Department.....	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
8	Love Morgan.....	Veterans Administration.....	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
9	Ruth Morgenstein.....	do.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
10	Dolores Rashella.....	Federal Public Housing Administration.....	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
11	Renee Roth.....	Federal Works Agency.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
12	Lt. Leslie Falk.....	U. S. Army.....	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
13	Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow.....	U. S. Navy.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
14	Rose Gerber.....	Navy Department.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
15	Jeannette Johnson.....	Veterans Administration.....	2,000			2,000
	Total.....		(12) 33,200	(13) 38,840	(13) 38,840	(12) 37,600

Committee on Military Affairs

[ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, chairman]

Number of position	Name of individual serving committee	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 4) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 6) November	(Jan. 6) December
1	Helen A. Rice.....	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff.....	(C. R. 14, p. 7603) \$2,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8263)	(C. R. 16, p. 8266)	(C. R. 17, p. 9000)	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3)
2	Theodore B. Stathart.....	War Department, Adjutant General's Office, Civilian Personnel Division.....	1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800
3	Col. David A. Watt.....	War Department, General Staff.....	6,000			6,000	6,000
4	Col. Lewis Sanders.....	War Department.....	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
5	Amy J. Tishendorf.....	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff.....				2,000	2,000
	Total.....		(4) 15,800	(2) 7,800	(2) 7,800	(4) 15,800	(4) 15,800

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR CONTRACTS

[JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

Number	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 4) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 6) November	(Jan. 6) December
1	Marian Bonner.....	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	\$2,300	(C. R. 16, p. 8262)	\$2,300	(C. R. 17, p. 8842)	
2	Kurt Borchardt.....	Smaller War Plants Corporation.....	5,600	5,600	5,600	\$5,600	\$5,600
3	Marion Foster.....	Navy Department.....	2,600	2,600	2,600		
4	Grace Mayer.....	Smaller War Plants Corporation.....	2,000	2,000	2,000		
5	Maj. Wm. E. Nefflin.....	War Department.....	3,000				
6	Vernice O'Mullane.....	War Production Board.....	1,620	1,620	1,620		
7	Doris Phippen.....	Navy Department.....	2,040	2,040	2,040	2,100	2,100
8	Omer J. Regnier.....	Farm Security Administration.....	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
9	Sigmund Timberg.....	Foreign Economic Administration.....	6,500	6,500			
10	Bertram M. Gross.....	Navy Department.....				6,500	6,500
11	Edna Ruben.....	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....				2,300	2,300
12	Ann Cheatham.....	Smaller War Plants Corporation.....				2,300	2,300
	Total.....		(9) 29,460	(8) 31,460	(7) 19,960	(5) 20,300	(6) 22,300

* To Oct. 8, 1944.

* To Sept. 14, 1944.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

[H. M. KILGORE, chairman]

Number	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 4) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 6) November	(Jan. 6) December
1	Virginia W. Boyce.....	Department of the Interior.....	\$1,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8263)	(C. R. 16, p. 8265)	(C. R. 18, p. 9350)	\$1,800
2	Ann S. Gertler.....	do.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
3	Hope C. Heslep.....	War Manpower Commission.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
4	Theodore C. Larson.....	National Housing Agency.....	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
5	Fritzie P. Manuel.....	War Manpower Commission.....	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
6	Darel McConkey.....	War Production Board.....	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
7	Cora L. Moen.....	Office of Price Administration.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
8	Walter Louis Moore.....	National Housing Agency.....	1,440				
9	Elizabeth H. Oleksy.....	War Production Board.....	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
10	Francis Rosenberger.....	Office of Price Administration.....	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
11	Herbert Schimmel.....	War Production Board.....	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
12	Dieyrelle M. Prouty.....	do.....	2,000	2,000	2,000		
	Total.....		(11) 38,440	(11) 39,000	(11) 39,000	(10) 37,000	(10) 37,000

Committee on Naval Affairs

[DAVID I. WALSH, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 2) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 1) November	(Jan. 2) December
1	Capt. James A. Saunders.....	Navy Department, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.	(C. R. 14, p. 7603) \$6,000+	(C. R. 16, p. 8263) \$6,000+	(C. R. 16, p. 8266) \$6,000+	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) \$6,000+	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 77) \$6,000+
2	Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson.	Navy Department, Potomac River Command.	\$1,512+	\$1,512+	\$1,512+	\$1,512+	\$1,512+
	Total.....		(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+

* Plus \$162 per month and rental allowance.

† Plus \$91.50 per month and rental allowance.

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

[DAVID I. WALSH, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	Sept. 27	Oct. 30	November	December
1	Lt. Frederic A. McLaughlin.....	Navy Department, Bureau of Naval Personnel.	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+
2	Lt. Joseph G. Feeney.....	do.....	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+
3	Yeoman Eleanor W. St. Clair.....	do.....	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+
4	Yeoman Loretta F. Jochman.....	do.....	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+
	Total.....		(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+

* Plus \$132 per month subsistence and rental allowance.

† Plus \$91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.

Committee on Pensions

[JAMES M. TUNNELL, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	Sept. 27	Oct. 30	November	December
1	Louis J. Meyerle.....	Veterans Administration.....	(C. R. 14, p. 7604) \$5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8261) \$5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) \$5,000	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) \$5,000	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78) \$5,000

Committee on Public Lands and Surveys

[CARL A. HATCH, chairman]

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PUBLIC LANDS

[PAT MCCARRAN, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			September	Oct. 27	(Dec. 1) November	(Dec. 31) December
1	E. S. Haskell.....	Agriculture Department, Forest Service.....	(C. R. 16, p. 8263) \$5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) \$5,000	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) \$5,000	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78) \$5,000
2	Elizabeth Heckman.....	do.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
	Total.....		(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000

Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			August to Sept. 1	Oct. 1	Month left blank November (?)	Dec. 1
1	Joe L. Martinez.....	U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(C. R. 15, p. 7992) \$3,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8262) \$3,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8265) \$3,800	(C. R. 18, p. 9351) \$3,800
2	Franklin N. Parks.....	Office of Price Administration.....	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
3	Harold G. Robinson.....	U. S. Maritime Commission.....	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
4	Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe.....	U. S. Army, General Staff (listed finance officer, December).	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
5	Lt. Col. Harry Vaughn.....	U. S. Army, General Staff.....	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000
	Total.....		(5) 23,100	(5) 23,100	(5) 23,600	(4) 17,600

Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises

[JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 1) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 1) November	(Jan. 1) December
1	Ruth B. Abrams.....	Foreign Economic Administration.....	(C. R. 14, p. 7604) \$3,200	(C. R. 16, p. 8261)	(C. R. 16, p. 8265)	(C. R. 17, p. 8842)	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78)
2	J. Russell Bower.....	Smaller War Plants Corporation.....	4,600				
3	Agnes E. Crivella.....	War Production Board.....	2,700	\$2,700	\$2,700	\$2,700	\$2,700
4	Emerald G. Devitt.....	do.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
5	Elsie A. Digges.....	do.....	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
6	F. Preston Forbes.....	Department of Commerce.....	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
7	Carol M. Fuller.....	Office of Price Administration.....	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
8	Scott K. Gray.....	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
9	Stella J. Goepfer.....	War Production Board.....	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
10	Dorothy M. Heckard.....	do.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Kathleen Kimball.....	do.....	1,800	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
12	Elizabeth P. Lucas.....	do.....	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
13	Lois M. Miller.....	do.....	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
14	Harry J. Evans.....	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....			6,500	6,500	6,500
Total.....			(13) 36,400	(11) 28,800	(12) 35,300	(12) 35,300	(12) 35,300

SEPARATE REPORT—SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

[JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

1	John W. Nelson.....	War Production Board.....	\$5,600	\$5,600	(?) \$5,600	\$5,600	\$5,600
2	Jessma Oslin.....	do.....	1,800				
3	Grace F. Purdy.....	Office of Price Administration.....	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
4	Arthur G. Silverman.....	do.....	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
5	Lt. George H. Soule.....	Navy Department.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
6	Lillian Evelyn Spicer.....	Navy Department [War Production Board Oct.].....	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
7	Frederick W. Steckman.....	Maritime Commission.....	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
8	Allen G. Thurman.....	do.....	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
9	Alfred J. Van Tassel.....	War Production Board.....	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
10	Olga Yelencsics.....	do.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Brainard Cheney.....	Foreign Economic Administration.....		6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
12	Margie L. Strubel.....	War Production Board.....		1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
13	Vernice O'Mullane.....	do.....					1,620
Total.....			(10) 40,400	(11) 46,900	(11) 46,900	(11) 46,900	(12) 48,520

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for the figures he has presented. We constantly hear from various sources condemnation of bureaucracy in government. If there is such a thing, we probably contribute to it under the policy we have been following in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution presented by the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate an original resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 55), as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 1, 1941; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 11, 1941; Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 17, 1942; Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 25, 1943; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 20, 1943; Senate Resolution 235, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944; and Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to August 23, 1944 (relating to the investigation of the war

program), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation, and state to the Senate a few facts in connection with the committee concerned. The committee was organized March 1, 1941. The total amount authorized by the Senate to date has been \$500,000. There is an unexpended balance of \$102,955.10. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who recently succeeded former Senator TRUMAN as chairman of the committee, advises me the committee will need no more funds at this time.

I might say furthermore that the so-called Mead committee has a great number of employees, but it is employing most of its help directly, and the employees are on the pay roll of the special committee. The committee has only four or five employees who are borrowed from the executive branch of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS, COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 10, and ask unani-

mous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. HILL on the 6th instant.

The amendment was in line 3, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ until July 1, 1945, an assistant clerk and an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rates, respectively, of \$3,600 and \$1,800 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish briefly to explain the resolution. There are a number of resolutions in the same category as the one just agreed to, in respect to the termination date of July 1, 1945. Another practice has grown up in the Senate whereby the contingent fund of the Senate is used to employ clerks or additional clerks the entire year for services to be performed for a particular committee. The contingent fund is just what its name indicates. It is a fund from which will be spent money for something that is unexpected, something that happens from unforeseen causes, and which the Appropriations Committee cannot immediately care for. It cares for all special committees. It was never intended that clerks employed

the year around should be paid out of the contingent fund.

There is a place where Senators can go if they wish to have clerks placed permanently on the pay roll. If the chairman of a committee deems it necessary to have an additional clerk or two additional clerks the proper place to present his case is before the Appropriations Committee. So in all these resolutions—and there are some 12 or 15 of them, involving that many clerks—we have definitely provided that the clerks may continue on the pay roll and be paid out of the contingent fund until July 1, 1945. In the interim it will be necessary for the chairmen of the respective committees who are interested in these clerks to appear at the proper time and present their cases to the Appropriations Committee.

The resolutions I am now presenting involve clerks who are attached to the standing committees, with the exception of one, and that is the Committee to Investigate the Conservation of Wild Animal Life, which has been in existence for so long that it has taken on the status of a standing committee rather than a temporary committee. There are two clerks attached to that committee. So that resolution comes within the same category as the other resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution as amended has been agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CONSERVATION OF WILD ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 43, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. BAILEY on the 22d instant.

The amendments were, in line 6 to strike out "\$13,000" and insert "\$3,250"; and in line 8, after the word "purpose" to insert a comma and "said amount being sufficient for the employment of the two clerks of said committee until July 15, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, authorizing a Special Committee to Investigate the Conservation of Wild Animal Life, hereby is continued from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$3,250 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purpose said amount being sufficient for the employment of the two clerks of said Committee until July 15, 1945.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate

Resolution 25, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. OVERTON on the 10th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That resolution No. 44, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Manufactures to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945, at the rate of \$2,040 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 26, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. STEWART on the 10th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 35, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945, at the rate of \$2,040 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 49, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 14, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,880 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I

report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 50, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 251, agreed to June 4, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 51, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. HILL (for Mr. ANDREWS) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 7, to strike out "until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 170, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 29, 1941, as supplemented by Senate Resolution 326, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 53, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GREEN) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 6, to strike out "to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 28, agreed to January 10, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,220 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect from February 1, 1945, until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO EXAMINE BILLS, ETC.—EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 64), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ an additional clerk in his office, who shall, in addition to any other duties if required, perform such duties in connection with the examination of enrolled bills as may be directed by the Secretary. The compensation of such additional clerk shall be at the rate of \$3,900 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until July 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. GUFFEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 330, agreed to December 15, 1942, authorizing Committee on Mines and Mining to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred reported it with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "until" to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANCE BY BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. WAGNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency, hereby is authorized to employ such expert, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the expenses incurred pursuant to this resolution until July 1, 1945 (which shall not exceed \$3,000), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment, and it

was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 32) authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk, reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the foregoing resolution (S. Res. 32), with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "until", to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution 15, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 54, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been submitted by Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER) on January 25, 1945.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "until", to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution 12, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Patents to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES IN RELATION TO THE NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 36, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 36), submitted by Mr. BREWSTER on January 18, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 13, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare), is hereby continued from February 1,

1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS FOR COMMITTEES

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 57), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority contained in the following resolutions hereby is terminated after June 30, 1945:

Senate Resolution 129, agreed to May 4, 1939, authorizing the Committee on Mines and Mining to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum;

Senate Resolution 311, agreed to June 23, 1944, authorizing the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum and \$1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent;

Senate Resolution 262, agreed to June 30, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an additional clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum; and

Senate Resolution 153, agreed to June 1, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Claims to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$3,600 per annum.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, agreed to July 10, 1935, authorizing a special committee to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby further extended and continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee may report to the Senate at any time prior to December 31, 1946. The said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$5,000, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it with an amendment, in line 9, after the name "Senate", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY—MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the clerk of the Judiciary Committee has just come into the Chamber to report to me that a message was received this morning from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who was telephoning from Chicago, with respect to Senate Resolution 17. It is my understanding that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has not reported that resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Nevada has requested me, on his behalf, to enter a motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of the resolution. He desires this to be done in order that he may have the opportunity, when he arrives here on Thursday, to bring the matter before the Senate for its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to enter such a motion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On behalf of the Senator from Nevada, I enter that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I inquire the nature of the motion which has just been entered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I stated that the senior Senator from Nevada, who is absent from the Senate on official business, telephoned to the clerk of the Judiciary Committee this morning and requested that I enter on his behalf a motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of Senate Resolution 17, which was submitted by the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of extending the work of the Judiciary Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, with respect to the investigation of the liquor industry.

Mr. WHITE. Is this a motion to discharge the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED—PRESERVATION OF COTTON AND WHEAT ALLOTMENTS

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is a noncontroversial bill on the calendar, namely, Senate bill 338, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I should like to obtain action on it. If any great amount of time is required, I shall not insist on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. OVERTON. I understand that there will be no debate, and that the bill can be disposed of promptly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I believe that to be true.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to

17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to preserve the allotments of wheat and cotton. Under the present law, if the allotments are not used for 3 years they are lost. There have been a great many diversions to war crops, and many allotments will be threatened after this year. Many farmers are in the service, and cannot plant their crops.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have made inquiry of such minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as I was able to consult, and I know of no opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "amended", to insert "or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to strike out "acres used for the production of any war crop, designated by the Secretary, in" and insert "for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 3, after the word "emergency", to strike out "on."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "crop", to strike out "year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "planted to" and insert "a farm on which."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 7, after the word "be", to insert "was planted."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the words "production of", to strike out "such", and in the same line, after the word "war", to strike out "crop" and insert "crops designated by him."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "acres" and insert "farm, or because the owner or operator was serving in the armed forces of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in establishing acreage allotments under subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Con-

servation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations prescribed by him, may provide that for any crop year (beginning with the crop year 1945, during the present emergency, any farm, with respect to which a cotton or wheat allotment was established for the 1942 crop shall be regarded as a farm on which cotton or wheat, as the case may be, was planted, if the Secretary determines that because of the production of war crops designated by him on such farm, or because the owner or operator was serving in the armed forces of the United States, the cotton or wheat production history of the farm for such year is not representative of the normal history of the farm.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY OUT OF RESPECT TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to state that, upon completion of the necessary business of the Senate today, it is the intention to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next as a mark of respect to the late Secretary of the Senate, Colonel Halsey. Accordingly I make such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may it be agreed that I will be permitted to address the Senate for approximately 10 or 15 minutes?

Mr. HILL. Of course, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that, on the completion of the necessary business of the Senate today, the Senate adjourn until Thursday next as a mark of respect to the late Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Committee on Commerce may have permission to file reports on any legislative or executive matters before it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Assuming that the Committee on Commerce reports during the interim, is it the expectation that the Senate will proceed on some basis on Thursday with the George bill and the nomination?

Mr. HILL. So far as the present occupant of the majority leader's chair knows at the present time, that is the intention.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 35, Calendar No. 21, being the river and harbor bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I pause in the consideration of the pending bill in order to pay a brief but well-deserved tribute to one of the greatest friends the cause of river and harbor improvements has ever had in the history of our country. On last Thursday, at his home in Aurora, Ill., Frank R. Reid passed into the great beyond. Mr. Reid was a Member of the House of Representatives, where he served from 1923 until 1934, when he voluntarily left that service in order to resume the practice of law. While he was a Member of the House of Representatives he was chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, and as such he prepared and had passed through the House, and he aided in passage through the Senate, and aided materially in having approved, the flood-control bill of May 15, 1928, relating to the lower Mississippi Valley. That is a historic enactment, because in it the Congress of the United States declared for the first time that flood control of the lower Mississippi Valley is a national obligation.

After Mr. Reid left the House of Representatives he continued to display an unflinching zeal and interest in flood control and river and harbor improvements. There was not a meeting of the Flood Control Association relating to the lower Mississippi Valley at which he was not present, according to my recollection; and there was not a meeting of the National River and Harbor Congress at which he was not present. At one time or another he held every high position in that congress.

Mr. Reid was a gentleman who made and held friends. He was sympathetic. He was affable. He was one of the most brilliant presiding officers I have ever known. His passing is a great loss to the cause of river and harbor improvement and of flood control in this Nation. I desire personally to extend my condolence to the members of his family. He was a devoted husband and a loving father.

Mr. President, the pending bill is a successor to the river and harbor bill of last session, which was House bill 3961. That bill and the companion bill, the flood-control measure of last session, had a very rocky road to travel. From the time when the Senate reconvened after the November election until the Seventy-eighth Congress was adjourned sine die, those two bills occupied practically all the time of the Senate. The flood-control bill was enacted into law and was approved by the President on December 22, 1944. But the river and harbor bill finally went on the rocks in the consideration of what is known as the Elliott amendment.

After giving thorough consideration to the whole subject matter and, I think,

in line with what I said on the floor of the Senate during the concluding days of the debate last December, I conceived the plan of preparing a bill which would be free of any controversial projects whatsoever, and which would not embrace any new projects. My purpose was to have authorization made for quite a large number of projects as to which there was no objection, and to avoid delay in the consideration of the bill resulting from hearings on new projects. So I prepared the pending bill, containing 291 projects which are uncontested, and to which there is no objection. Each of the 291 projects has been approved by the Chief of Engineers. All of them have undergone committee hearings. Each has been voted upon favorably by the Senate. The additional projects which were inserted in the bill, to which there was no objection on the part of the Senate, were agreed to by the House when it adopted the conference report. Therefore, the bill contains projects which have been agreed to in both the Senate and the House, and which have even been agreed to without debate, because all of them are meritorious and none of them are subject to objection.

Among the projects which we have eliminated from the bill—projects which are controversial in their nature—is the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, in Alabama and Mississippi, which had an estimated Federal cost of \$66,000,000. On January 2, 1945, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors adopted a resolution providing for a restudy and review of that project. Later on, in due course, a report on it will be made.

I wish to thank both of the very able and distinguished Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL] and the able and distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] for their cooperation with me in connection with that matter, and for agreeing not to offer during consideration of the pending bill, either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, an amendment having to do with the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Inasmuch as I perhaps wielded on the floor of the Senate the ax which did considerable damage to the Tombigbee project, I should like to state that the course which the Senator from Alabama now outlines in respect to a resurvey is precisely the course which I said I would approve. I am very happy that such a course is to be taken. I think that when the conclusive down-to-date report is available from the Chief of Engineers the Senators from Alabama and Mississippi will be entitled to another day in court.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator from Michigan.

The next project which was eliminated was with reference to the Beaver-Mahoning Rivers in Pennsylvania and Ohio. The total project was to be constructed at an estimated cost of approximately \$38,000,000, of which all but \$1,500,000 had been previously authorized.

I wish to thank the Senators from Ohio for their cooperation in agreeing to the elimination of this project from the pending bill.

We have also deleted from the bill the Savannah River and Clark Hill Reservoir in Georgia, the estimated cost of which is \$28,000,000. We eliminated the project because it was authorized in the flood-control act which was passed at the last session of Congress.

There has also been omitted from the bill the Santee and Congaree Rivers project in North Carolina and South Carolina. The estimated cost of construction of the initial stage of the project was \$25,000,000. That item was inserted in House bill 3961 by the Senate. It was agreed to in the Senate but the House conferees insisted on its rejection because local interests desired to be heard in connection with the matter. The House conferees took the position that the local interests had not had an adequate opportunity to be heard. The Senate conferees receded. Therefore, we considered the project as falling within the classification of objected-to projects.

I wish to thank the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] for his willingness to cooperate with the Senate Commerce Committee in the elimination of this particular project from the pending bill.

Mr. President, there are also not contained in this bill the Missouri River Basin multiple-purpose projects. Provision was made in the river and harbor bill at the last Congress for an authorization of \$200,000,000 to initiate those projects. However, the projects were authorized in the flood control act of last year, and to include them in this bill would be merely an attempt to reauthorize them. They have therefore been eliminated. However, there remains in the bill the navigation project in the lower Missouri River Basin from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River.

Mr. President, as I stated a few minutes ago, the rock upon which House bill 3961—that noble ship—went to pieces was the Elliott amendment which provided that the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws should not be applicable to lands which receive their waters from the Central Valley project in the State of California. The amendment, which was adopted on the floor of the House last year, is not contained in this bill. When it came over to the Senate for consideration the Senate Commerce Committee recommended its elimination. It was eliminated on the floor of the Senate, but the Senate conferees yielded, and it was restored to the bill. The Senate rejected the conference report and later a motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was rejected, but before a vote could be taken on that motion the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned sine die.

I wish to thank the very able and distinguished Senator from California for his willingness, his splendid cooperation, and his manifestation of patriotism in being perfectly willing that this very controversial item be not included in the pending bill. I understand that the able

author of the amendment, Representative ELLIOTT, has indicated that he will not urge the inclusion of the amendment in Senate bill 35 when it reaches the House.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that this bill does not contain provisions with reference to power and irrigation which were included in House bill 3961. The reason for that is perfectly obvious. The identical provisions with reference to power and irrigation which were included in the river and harbor bill were likewise made a part of the flood-control bill. They were in identical language. The flood-control bill has become law, and therefore the power and irrigation provisions are now law. There is no necessity to include them in the pending bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In other words, section 5 of the flood-control bill which was passed at the last session of Congress, now known as Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, and which made provision with reference to the distribution of electric power generated at the reservoir projects, will apply to the projects in the pending river and harbor bill in exactly the same way that it applies to the projects in the flood-control bill. Am I correct in my statement?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. Section 5 and section 8 of the flood control act apply not only to the projects contained in the pending bill, but also to all projects under the control of the War Department, whether authorized in this bill, in the flood-control bill, or in any other bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Have any of the projects which were eliminated from the similar bill which we considered before the adjournment of the last session of Congress been restored to the pending bill?

Mr. OVERTON. No; none of those projects has been restored to the present bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Then, the pending bill is practically the same bill which was passed by the Senate during the last session of Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

The estimated cost of the 291 projects contained in this bill is \$381,968,332. This is \$320,530,000 less than the estimated cost of the projects in last year's bill, or, in other words, almost a 50-percent reduction in the estimated cost. The reduction has been brought about not only by reason of the elimination of controversial projects but also by the elimination of what would be a duplication of projects.

Now I wish to say to the Senate that is the intention, I think, of both the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives and of the Senate Commerce Committee, to prepare later on in the session another river and harbor bill. In that river and harbor bill both committees will consider all new projects which have been reported since

hearings on the bill of last year and any project which has not been authorized in the pending bill, and will also consider any controversial projects and also any amendments, for instance, the Elliott amendment or any other amendment which may be more or less controversial in nature, the purpose being to get the pending bill through as rapidly as possible, because there is no controversy in reference to any project or general provision in this bill.

I have a letter from Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, which I wish to take the liberty of reading in part to the Senate as evidence of what is intended. This letter was written on January 12, addressed to me by Judge MANSFIELD, and in it he says:

DEAR SENATOR OVERTON: I have examined with interest Senate bill 35, introduced in your behalf by Senator BAILEY. It is my understanding that the bill seeks to authorize the uncontested projects as contained in the rivers and harbors bill (H. R. 3961), which failed of passage in the last Congress.

I express the sincere and earnest hope that the bill as introduced may be promptly passed by the Senate. If and when that is accomplished, I shall immediately proceed in an effort to obtain similar action in the House. If no controversial items are added, I have every confidence it will be accepted by the House.

Since the bill was reported to the Senate by the Commerce Committee, some few additional reports on new projects have been received and no doubt others will be submitted by the Board and Chief of Engineers from time to time. It is my intention, and in this I am sure I shall have the enthusiastic support of the House, Rivers and Harbors Committee, to report another rivers and harbors bill to take care of additional projects during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter written by Judge MANSFIELD be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point and also a copy of my reply to Judge MANSFIELD in which I approve the course he outlines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter was as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1945.

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON,
Chairman, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee,
Senate Commerce Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR OVERTON: I have examined with interest Senate bill 35, introduced in your behalf by Senator BAILEY. It is my understanding that the bill seeks to authorize the uncontested projects as contained in the river and harbor bill (H. R. 3961), which failed of passage in the last Congress.

I express the sincere and earnest hope that the bill as introduced may be promptly passed by the Senate. If and when that is accomplished, I shall immediately proceed in an effort to obtain similar action in the House. If no controversial items are added, I have every confidence it will be accepted by the House.

Since the bill was reported to the Senate by the Commerce Committee, some few additional reports on new projects have been received and no doubt others will be submitted by the Board and Chief of Engineers from time to time. It is my intention, and in this I am sure I shall have the enthusiastic

support of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, to report another river and harbor bill to take care of additional projects during the present session of the Congress.

I think it highly important in the public interest that S. 35 should be enacted into law as soon as possible. While the bill specifically provides "that no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect," there are a number of projects the bill will authorize which already have been certified as "being necessary and desirable in the interest of the national defense." In addition, and as you are of course advised, authorization of the projects will enable the engineers to proceed with the preparation of plans and specifications in order that there may be no delay in the construction of projects if and when they are needed when the war is over.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on
Rivers and Harbors.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1945.
Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on
Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 12th instant advising me that you have examined S. 35, being the river and harbor bill introduced in the Senate, and that it meets with your approval.

I am very pleased to observe that as soon as the bill has passed the Senate you will undertake to have it acted upon favorably in your committee and by the House. I am especially interested in your statement that you will later in the year undertake hearings on a new river and harbor bill, embracing projects that have been favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers subsequent to the consideration of last session's bill by the Senate Commerce Committee. I most heartily approve of this course.

I thank you for your continued cooperation in the enactment of this important legislation and can assure you that I shall do all in my power to aid you in the furtherance of your views and plans with respect not only to the pending bill but to future river and harbor bills.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN H. OVERTON,
United States Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I cannot close this general presentation of the pending bill without thanking the members of the Commerce Committee for their splendid cooperation. This bill has been unanimously recommended by the Senate Commerce Committee for passage by the Senate. I cannot refrain from expressing my very deep and warm appreciation of the courtesy and the able counsel which have been given to me at all times by the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. In this as in all other matters in which I have had any occasion to be active before his committee he has been

extraordinarily helpful, patient, and sympathetic.

Mr. President, there are a few committee amendments to the bill, but they are only clerical in nature. The first section of the bill as prepared contained an enunciation of general principles and also the authorization of various projects. On the recommendation of the War Department we divided the first section into two sections, section 1 relating to the general principles enunciated by the bill, and the second section relating to the authorizations. Because of that separation a renumbering of the sections has been required. Those are the main amendments.

There is another amendment to strike out the word "of" and insert the word "for," and then another amendment where there was a typographical error in referring to a House document, and that is corrected. This completes the amendments.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was on page 23, line 6, to strike out "chief" and insert "Chief".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "669" and insert "659".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 39, line 8, after the word "liability", to strike out "of" and insert "for".

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments except for renumbering the sections. Without objection, the amendments renumbering the sections are agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment heretofore offered by me and lying on the table be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 3, after the word "navigation", it is proposed to insert "flood control."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is merely in connection with an item for a preliminary examination and survey. I have no objection to any preliminary examination and survey amendments that may be offered, and therefore I make no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator if there would be any objection to the amendment I left with the committee providing for an examination of the possibilities of deepening the channel to Beaufort, S. C., through St. Helena Sound or through Port Royal Sound?

Mr. OVERTON. Has the Senator the amendment prepared?

Mr. MAYBANK. I sent it to the committee, and have it not with me at the moment. I can prepare it, however. It merely provides for an investigation.

Mr. OVERTON. There will be no objection to it. I do not think it is contained in the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; it is not.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator had a copy of it there would be no objection to providing for a preliminary examination and survey. As I understand, that is all the amendment proposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all, of the channel to Beaufort, S. C.

Mr. OVERTON. There will be no objection to it. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to offer it later, and that it be incorporated in the bill as passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Carolina send the amendment to the desk?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. LANGER] intends to address himself to the bill.

Mr. LANGER. No.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator going to speak before the bill is passed?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In that event there will be ample time for the Senator from South Carolina to prepare his amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Dakota speaks let me say that I have had prepared a list of the projects contained in the pending bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35

Project ¹	Document No. ²	Federal first cost
Northeast Harbor, Maine	H. 132, 76th Cong.	\$94,500
Isle au Haut Thoroughfare, Maine	S. 15, 77th Cong.	28,000
Hendricks Harbor, Maine	S. 40, 76th Cong.	6,000
Portland Harbor, Maine	H. 560, 76th Cong.	780,000
Portland Harbor, Maine, and the maintenance of Soldier Ledge Channel in Hussey Sound, Casco Bay, at a depth of 40 feet.	Oct. 26, 1942 ³	(⁴)
Josias River, Maine	H. 227, 76th Cong.	32,000
Newburyport Harbor, Mass.	H. 703, 76th Cong.	68,000
Gloucester Harbor and Annisquam River, Mass.	H. 329, 77th Cong.	46,667
Manchester Harbor, Mass.	H. 447, 77th Cong.	207,300
Salem Harbor, Mass.	H. 701, 76th Cong.	43,000
Marblehead Harbor, Mass.	H. 85, 77th Cong.	60,000
Boston Harbor, Mass.	Apr. 28, 1943 ¹	660,000
Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.	H. 394, 77th Cong.	322,400
Weymouth Fore River, Mass.	H. 291, 77th Cong.	200,000
Cohasset Harbor, Mass.	H. 425, 76th Cong.	62,000
Duxbury Harbor, Mass.	S. 115, 77th Cong.	71,000
Chatham (Stage) Harbor, Mass.	H. 456, 77th Cong.	43,500
Wellfleet Harbor, Mass.	H. 557, 76th Cong.	64,000
Hyannis Harbor, Mass.	H. 98, 77th Cong.	62,500
Cape Cod Canal (Onset Bay), Mass.	H. 431, 77th Cong.	48,000
Nantucket Harbor, Mass.	H. 115, 77th Cong.	31,500

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Menemsha Creek, Martha's Vineyard, Mass.	H. 365, 76th Cong.	\$37,500
Wickford Harbor, R. I.	S. 105, 77th Cong.	22,000
Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I.	H. 330, 77th Cong.	8,000
Pawcatuck River, R. I. and Conn.	H. 839, 76th Cong.	30,000
Mystic River, Conn.	H. 349, 77th Cong.	20,000
Thames River, Conn.	H. 367, 76th Cong.	(⁴)
Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.	H. 368, 76th Cong.	72,900
Clinton Harbor, Conn.	H. 240, 76th Cong.	21,900
Gulford Harbor, Conn.	H. 149, 77th Cong.	25,500
New Haven Harbor, Conn., except the further improvement of Quinnipiac River.	H. 307, 76th Cong.	1,673,000
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.	H. 819, 76th Cong.	529,000
Norwalk Harbor, Conn.	H. 220, 76th Cong.	29,500
Mianus River, Conn.	H. 549, 78th Cong.	26,500
Greenwich Harbor, Conn.	H. 125, 76th Cong.	31,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway.	Apr. 14, 1942 ¹	1,010,000
Jamaica Bay, N. Y.	H. 700, 76th Cong.	270,000
Jones Inlet, N. Y.	H. 409, 77th Cong.	500,000
Northport Harbor, N. Y.	H. 109, 76th Cong.	15,000
Peconie River, N. Y.	H. 237, 76th Cong.	20,000
Lake Montauk Harbor, N. Y.	H. 369, 76th Cong.	65,000
Orowoc Creek, N. Y.	H. 126, 76th Cong.	15,200
Passaic River, N. J.	H. 420, 76th Cong.	(⁴)
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N. J.	May 20, 1942 ¹	3,390,000
Way Cake Creek, N. J.	H. 624, 77th Cong.	30,000
Compton Creek, N. J.	H. 673, 76th Cong.	16,000
Shark River, N. J.	H. 102, 76th Cong.	118,000
New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway.	H. 133, 76th Cong.	1,500,000
Manasquan River, N. J.	H. 355, 77th Cong.	143,000
Toms River, N. J.	H. 393, 77th Cong.	141,000
Cold Spring Inlet, N. J.	H. 262, 77th Cong.	15,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea.	H. 580, 76th Cong.	1,036,000
Do.	H. 340, 77th Cong.	3,380,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, and the maintenance of enlarged channel opposite the Philadelphia Navy Yard.	(⁴)	(⁴)
Delaware River at Camden, N. J.	H. 353, 77th Cong.	373,000
Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.	H. 344, 77th Cong.	224,000
Indian River, Del.	H. 330, 76th Cong.	151,000
Nanticoke River, Del. and Md.	S. 69, 77th Cong.	54,000
Susquehanna River, above and below Havre de Grace, Md.	S. 67, 76th Cong.	18,000
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.	June 30, 1942 ¹	2,388,000
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md., and channel in Curtis Creek.	(⁴)	150,000
Mill Creek, Md.	H. 100, 76th Cong.	4,200
Broadwater Creek, Md.	H. 622, 77th Cong.	30,000
Cadle Creek, Md.	H. 465, 76th Cong.	5,500
Channel to Island Creek, St. George Island, Md.	H. 99, 76th Cong.	10,000
Saint Catherine's Sound, Md.	H. 242, 76th Cong.	10,900
Black Walnut Harbor, Md.	H. 217, 76th Cong.	21,000
Town Creek, Md.	H. 219, 76th Cong.	25,000
Duck Point Cove, Md.	H. 241, 76th Cong.	19,500
Lower Thoroughfare, Deals Island, Md.	H. 238, 76th Cong.	22,000
Crisfield Harbor, Md.	H. 457, 76th Cong.	(⁴)
Pocomoke River, Md.	H. 429, 76th Cong.	4,250
Waterway on the coast of Virginia.	H. 268, 76th Cong.	263,000
Oecobanock Creek, Va.	H. 223, 78th Cong.	37,000
Oyster Channel, Va.	H. 716, 76th Cong.	29,000
Onancock River, Va.	H. 358, 76th Cong.	(⁴)
Tangier Channel, Va.	H. 141, 77th Cong.	10,100
Cranes Creek, Va.	H. 687, 76th Cong.	7,500
Totuskey Creek, Va.	H. 686, 76th Cong.	44,000
Hoskins Creek, Va.	H. 129, 77th Cong.	16,000
Urbanna Creek, Va.	H. 285, 76th Cong.	9,600
Whitings Creek, Va.	H. 582, 76th Cong.	11,500
Broad Creek, Va.	H. 381, 76th Cong.	20,500
Pamunkey River, Va.	H. 671, 76th Cong.	10,000
Appomattox River, Va.	H. 223, 76th Cong.	110,000
Hampton Creek, Va.	H. 559, 76th Cong.	15,000
Cape Charles City Harbor, Va.	May 12, 1942 ¹	158,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Norfolk Harbor, Va.	H. 224, 76th Cong. (9)	\$35,000
Little River, Va. main-tenance work.		(9)
James River, Va.	H. 738, 77th Cong.	27,000
Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beau-fort Inlet, N. C.	H. 117, 76th Cong.	39,000
Chowan River, N. C., and Blackwater River, Va.	H. 101, 76th Cong.	135,000
Pembroke Creek, N. C.	H. 235, 76th Cong.	9,500
Channel from Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe, N. C.	H. 234, 76th Cong.	5,000
Channel from Pamlico Sound to Avon, N. C.	H. 316, 76th Cong.	16,500
Rollinson Channel, Waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.	H. 236, 76th Cong.	27,000
Neuse and Trent Rivers, N. C.	H. 239, 76th Cong.	22,500
Channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay with Cedar Bay, N. C.	H. 623, 77th Cong.	11,000
Waterway connecting Pamlico Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	S. 87, 76th Cong.	20,000
Channel from Back Sound to Lookout Bight, N. C.	H. 99, 77th Cong.	35,000
Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	S. 247, 77th Cong.	7,000
Inland waterway, Beau-fort to Cape Fear River, N. C., includ-ing waterway to Jack-sonville, N. C.	H. 746, 77th Cong.	20,000
Do.	H. 334, 76th Cong.	54,000
Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wil-mington.	H. 660, 76th Cong.	24,000
Do.	H. 346, 77th Cong.	9,000
Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N. C.	H. 131, 76th Cong.	675,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Winyah Bay, S. C.	S. 83, 76th Cong.	790,000
Winyah Bay, S. C.	S. 170, 76th Cong.	73,000
Beresford Creek, S. C.	H. 327, 76th Cong.	11,000
Charleston Harbor, S. C.	H. 211, 76th Cong.	1,260,000
Shipyard River, S. C.	H. 602, 76th Cong.	21,000
Abbeville Creek, S. C.	H. 156, 77th Cong.	1,820,000
Russell Creek, S. C.	Apr. 11, 1942 ¹	246,500
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	H. 97, 76th Cong.	10,800
Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.	S. 41, 76th Cong.	15,500
Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Saint Johns River, Fla.	H. 283, 76th Cong.	281,000
Fernandina Harbor and Amelia River, Fla.	H. 610, 77th Cong.	(9)
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean.	H. 114, 77th Cong.	(9)
Do.	H. 284, 77th Cong.	(9)
St. Johns River, Fla., Palatka to Lake Harney.	H. 322, 77th Cong.	725,000
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney.	S. 230, 78th Cong.	3,200,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.	(9)	2,032,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., Vero Beach.	Oct. 26, 1942 ¹	11,789,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., to Sebastian Inlet.	H. 261, 76th Cong.	7,300
Canaveral Harbor, Fla.	H. 336, 76th Cong.	19,000
St. Lucie Inlet, Fla.	H. 367, 77th Cong.	820,500
Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.	H. 391, 77th Cong.	46,000
New River, Fla.	H. 530, 78th Cong.	711,000
Miami Harbor, Fla.	H. 553, 76th Cong.	60,000
Do.	June 24, 1942 ¹	5,781,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Miami to Key West, Fla.	Mar. 19, 1942 ¹	78,000
Do.	Oct. 26, 1942 ¹	1,830,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okechobee drainage areas, Florida.	H. 696, 76th Cong.	\$208,000
Do.	June 5, 1943 ¹	5,100
Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosa-hatchee River to the Anclote River, Fla.	H. 371, 76th Cong.	3,200,000
Little Manatee River, Fla.	H. 552, 76th Cong.	77,000
Tampa Harbor, Fla.	S. 16, 77th Cong.	189,000
Do.	H. 119, 77th Cong.	60,000
Anclote River, Fla.	S. 183, 78th Cong.	607,400
Pithlachascotee River, Fla.	H. 243, 76th Cong.	10,000
St. Marks River, Fla.	H. 86, 77th Cong.	51,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to St. Marks River, Fla.	H. 345, 77th Cong.	71,000
Apalachicola, Chat-tahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla.	H. 442, 76th Cong.	32,500
St. Josephs Bay, Fla.	H. 342, 76th Cong.	6,500,000
Do.	S. 17, 77th Cong.	(9)
Watson Bayou, Fla.	(9)	225,000
Pensacola Harbor, Fla.	H. 555, 76th Cong.	(9)
Alabama-Coosa River, Ala.	Apr. 3, 1943 ¹	162,000
Mobile Harbor, Ala.	H. 414, 77th Cong.	60,000,000
Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala. and Miss.	Oct. 26, 1942 ¹	475,000
Dauphin Island Bay Channel, Ala.	H. 276, 76th Cong.	6,750,000
Bayou Caden, Ala.	H. 382, 77th Cong.	115,000
Bayou La Batre, Ala.	H. 333, 76th Cong.	88,000
Biloxi Harbor, Miss.	H. 824, 77th Cong.	6,880
Do.	H. 281, 76th Cong.	27,500
Pass Christian Harbor, Miss.	H. 258, 76th Cong.	4,000
Bayou Galere, Miss.	H. 326, 76th Cong.	6,000
Bayous La Loutre, St. Malo, and Yscloskey, La.	S. 214, 77th Cong.	17,000
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico.	H. 112, 76th Cong.	6,000
Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Algiers at New Orleans, La.	S. 116, 77th Cong.	35,000
Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La.	H. 215, 76th Cong.	4,200,000
Calcasieu River and Pass, La.	S. 188, 78th Cong.	8,000,000
Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway.	H. 594, 78th Cong.	160,000
Do.	H. 465, 77th Cong.	55,000
Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway to Harlingen, Tex.	H. 428, 76th Cong.	6,300
Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway to Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.	H. 383, 77th Cong.	48,000
Do.	H. 402, 77th Cong.	600,000
Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex.	S. 248, 78th Cong.	25,500
Trinity River and tribu-taries, Tex.	H. 685, 76th Cong.	10,000
Lavon Reservoir on East Fork of Trinity River, Tex.	S. 60, 77th Cong.	18,000
Houston Ship Channel, Tex.	S. 153, 77th Cong.	27,000
Do.	S. 98, 76th Cong.	23,000,000
Clear Creek and Clear Lake, Tex.	H. 403, 77th Cong.	15,000,000
Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex.	H. 533, 78th Cong.	3,733,000
Channel from Pass Ca-vallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.	H. 226, 76th Cong.	21,300
Lavaca and Navidad Rivers, Tex.	H. 256, 76th Cong.	3,675,000
Do.	Aug. 21, 1943 ¹	484,000
Guadalupe River, Tex.	H. 319, 77th Cong.	30,000
Aranas Pass-Corpus Christie Channel, Tex.	H. 337, 76th Cong.	70,000
Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.	Dec. 10, 1943 ¹	120,000
Do.	H. 314, 76th Cong.	85,000
Onachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.	H. 659, 77th Cong.	348,000
Do.	H. 247, 76th Cong.	8,500,000
Do.	H. 544, 78th Cong.	830,000
Do.	H. 335, 76th Cong.	127,500
Do.	H. 347, 77th Cong.	635,000
Do.	H. 104, 76th Cong.	(9)

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Mississippi River be-tween Ohio and Mis-souri Rivers.	H. 231, 76th Cong.	\$10,200,000
Mississippi River be-tween Missouri River and Minneapolis.	H. 432, 77th Cong.	(9)
Do.	(9)	(9)
Do.	H. 103, 76th Cong.	11,500
Do.	H. 547, 76th Cong.	88,800
Do.	H. 263, 77th Cong.	17,000
Do.	H. 449, 78th Cong.	(9)
Do.	H. 137, 76th Cong.	33,000
Do.	H. 145, 76th Cong.	25,900,000
Illinois waterway, Ill., and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ind.	H. 214, 76th Cong.	6,000,000
Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth.	(9)	75,000
Scioto River at Ports-mouth, Ohio.	H. 446, 78th Cong.	2,030,635
Coasts of the Great Lakes; harbors of re-fuge for light-draft ves-sels.	H. 216, 76th Cong.	15,000
Baudette Harbor, Minn.	H. 686, 77th Cong.	14,000
Harbor at Knife River, Minn.	H. 337, 77th Cong.	24,000
Ashland Harbor, Wis.	H. 228, 76th Cong.	(9)
Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis.	H. 95, 76th Cong.	56,000
Green Bay Harbor, Wis.	H. 421, 78th Cong.	11,000
Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wis.	S. 29, 76th Cong.	110,000
Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.	H. 816, 77th Cong.	(9)
Racine Harbor, Wis.	H. 255, 78th Cong.	47,000
Do.	H. 116, 77th Cong.	34,000
Waukegan Harbor, Ill.	H. 233, 76th Cong.	910,000
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.	H. 129, 76th Cong.	74,000
St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.	H. 661, 76th Cong.	150,000
Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich.	H. 380, 77th Cong.	147,000
Manistee Harbor, Mich.	H. 679, 78th Cong.	1,412,000
St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, Bridge Island.	H. 339, 77th Cong.	3,500,000
St. Marys River, Mich., power plant.	H. 309, 77th Cong.	135,000
St. Clair River at South-east Bend, Mich.	Oct. 26, 1942 ¹	85,300
Detroit River, Mich.	H. 328, 76th Cong.	(9)
Sandusky Harbor, Ohio.	H. 161, 77th Cong.	30,000
Lorain Harbor, Ohio.	(9)	(9)
Do.	H. 232, 76th Cong.	191,000
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.	Feb. 14, 1942 ¹	30,000
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, and the extension of the channel in Cuya-hoga River, Ohio.	H. 321, 77th Cong.	38,000
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.	(9)	(9)
Erie Harbor, Pa.	Oct. 26, 1942 ¹	467,000
Do.	H. 352, 78th Cong.	3,171,000
Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.	Apr. 16, 1942 ¹	108,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Har-bor, N. Y.	H. 679, 76th Cong.	131,000
Wilson Harbor, N. Y.	H. 139, 76th Cong.	10,000
Rochester Harbor, N. Y.	Jan. 6, 1944 ¹	121,000
Sackets Harbor, N. Y.	H. 363, 76th Cong.	59,000
Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y.	H. 390, 77th Cong.	165,000
San Diego Harbor, Calif.	S. 138, 78th Cong.	259,000
Newport Bay Harbor, Calif.	H. 348, 77th Cong.	(9)
Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.	H. 283, 77th Cong.	800,000
Morro Bay, Calif.	(9)	(9)
Morro Bay, Calif., and further harbor devel-opment as desired by the Navy Depart-ment.	H. 266, 76th Cong.	74,000
Monterey Harbor, Calif.	(9)	350,000
Monterey Bay (Moss Landing), Calif.	Nov. 3, 1941 ¹	483,000
Redwood Creek, Calif.	H. 466, 77th Cong.	(9)
Oakland Harbor, Calif.	(9)	(47)
Do.	H. 715, 76th Cong.	25,000
Richmond Harbor, Calif.	H. 217, 77th Cong.	7,600
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif.	H. 682, 76th Cong.	600,000
Noyo Harbor, Calif.	H. 688, 76th Cong.	1,610,000
Crescent City Harbor, Calif.		

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Crescent City Harbor, Calif., and the construction of an inner breakwater.	(9)	\$200,000
Chetco River, Oreg....	H. 817, 77th Cong.	190,000
Coquille River, Oreg....	H. 672, 76th Cong.	(9)
Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg....	S. 86, 76th Cong....	55,000
Umpqua River, Oreg....	S. 191, 77th Cong....	34,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg....	S. 119, 77th Cong....	162,000
Depoe Bay, Oreg....	H. 350, 77th Cong....	214,000
Salmon River, Oreg....	H. 551, 76th Cong....	5,000
Bayocan Peninsula, Oreg....	(9)	120,000
Willamette River, Oreg....	H. 544, 75th Cong....	3,600,000
Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho.	H. 704, 75th Cong....	58,625,000
Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg....	(9)	50,000
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to the mouth of Snake River, Oreg., and Wash.	S. 28, 76th Cong....	39,000
Do.....	H. 324, 77th Cong....	30,000
Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.	H. 704, 75th Cong....	49,470,000
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville, Oreg....	H. 218, 76th Cong....	45,000
Columbia and Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg....	H. 241, 77th Cong....	12,000
Do.....	H. 630, 77th Cong....	81,000
Baker Bay, Columbia River, Wash.	H. 443, 76th Cong....	170,000
Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.	H. 481, 76th Cong....	20,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River to Aberdeen, Wash.	(9)	160,000
Quillayute River, Wash.	H. 218, 78th Cong....	(9)
Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.	H. 331, 77th Cong....	10,000
Olympia Harbor, Wash.	H. 699, 76th Cong....	88,000
Tacoma Harbor, Wash.	H. 124, 76th Cong....	160,000
Stillaguamish River, Wash.	H. 286, 77th Cong....	35,000
Lake Crockett, Wash....	H. 303, 77th Cong....	225,000
Metlakatla Harbor, Alaska.	H. 138, 76th Cong....	120,000
Craig Harbor, Alaska....	H. 558, 76th Cong....	80,000
Meyers Chuck Harbor, Alaska.	H. 222, 76th Cong....	25,000
Wrangell Harbor, Alaska.	H. 284, 76th Cong....	189,000
Wrangell Narrows, Alaska.	H. 260, 76th Cong....	2,731,000
Sitka Harbor, Alaska....	Mar. 14, 1944 ¹	285,000
Skagway Harbor, Alaska.	Apr. 11, 1942 ²	16,000
Petersburg Harbor, Alaska.	H. 670, 76th Cong....	80,000
Port Alexander, Alaska.	H. 578, 76th Cong....	31,000
Gastineau Channel, Alaska.	H. 325, 77th Cong....	155,000
Elfin Cove, Alaska....	H. 579, 76th Cong....	38,000
Seldovia Harbor, Alaska.	H. 702, 76th Cong....	50,000
Keehi Lagoon, Oahu, T. H.	H. 379, 77th Cong....	(9)
Port Allen Harbor, T. H.	H. 180, 77th Cong....	75,000
San Juan Harbor, P. R....	(9)	(9)
Ponce Harbor, P. R....	May 21, 1942 ³	400,000
Fajardo Harbor, P. R....	H. 286, 76th Cong....	211,000
Total, 291 projects.		381,968,332

¹ Listed geographically as in the bill.

² Document and Congress; "H" indicates House; "S" indicates Senate.

³ Date of report of Chief of Engineers, which was not printed.

⁴ Maintenance only.

⁵ In accordance with report on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

⁶ No additional cost to the United States.

⁷ River and Harbor Act, Aug. 30, 1935.

⁸ Reduction of \$2,100 in cost.

⁹ Work already accomplished in the interest of the war effort.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the appropriate place in the bill the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] desires to offer as a preliminary survey item the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert in section 5, following the item on Cooper River, S. C., on page 49, after line 6, the following:

Channel from the ocean through St. Helena Sound or through Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 35) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, following my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of letters which I have received during the past few weeks commenting upon the proposed full employment bill, recently introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself.

These letters are from the following officials: Leo T. Crowley, Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration; Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration; John B. Blandford, Jr., Administrator, National Housing Agency.

I should particularly like to call the attention of the Senate to the following statement on the bill made by the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration:

In accordance with our traditional economic concepts the initial burden of achieving continuing full employment is placed upon private, non-governmental sources. Government participation is limited to encouraging and creating the optimum conditions conducive to the meeting of this burden by private enterprise alone. But, if private enterprise cannot alone meet this burden, direct Government investment and expenditures which not only will assure full employment but will add to the wealth of the Nation must, as the bill provides, be undertaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,

January 24, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In your letter of December 16, 1944, you ask me for my views on a proposed bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment.

The proposed bill requires that the President shall transmit to Congress at each regular session a report on the estimated number of jobs needed to insure continuing full employment for the coming fiscal year or years, the estimated amount of investment and other expenditures which will provide such

jobs, and the estimated volume of prospective investment and expenditures. If prospective investments and expenditures are less than the amount necessary to assure full employment, the President is required to recommend a program for encouraging non-Federal investment and expenditures. To the extent that such expenditures are insufficient to take up the lag the President is required to recommend a program of Federal investment and expenditures.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the objectives sought to be attained by the bill and the approach taken toward that end. Every American able and willing to work has the right to a useful and remunerative job and it should be, as section 2 declares, the responsibility of the Government to guarantee that right by creating conditions which will tend to bring about continuing full employment.

In accordance with our traditional economic concepts the initial burden of achieving continuing full employment is placed upon private, nongovernmental sources. Government participation is limited to encouraging and creating the optimum conditions conducive to the meeting of this burden by private enterprise alone. But, if private enterprise cannot alone meet this burden, direct Government investment and expenditures which not only will assure full employment but will add to the wealth of the Nation must, as the bill provides, be undertaken.

The right to individual economic security, no less than the right to engage in private enterprise, is an indispensable component of a vigorous and healthy democracy. Mass unemployment and the resulting economic insecurity breed the very evils which endanger private enterprise and all other democratic institutions. It is the duty of government to be prepared to meet any threats to its existence from enemy attack it should be no less its duty to be prepared to meet any threats which may arise from economic conditions. The proposed bill recognizes and undertakes to discharge that very obligation.

I have been advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

January 22, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: With reference to your letter of December 16, 1944, enclosing a copy of your bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment," I am happy to make the following comments on this measure, which I understand has not yet been introduced in Congress.

As you know, my associates and I are most interested in the development of an effective program for full employment in the United States. Such a program is intimately related to our general efforts to build a secure and prosperous world in the post-war period. Therefore, it is essential that the specific methods which are employed to promote high and stable levels of productive employment should be formulated with a view to their international implications.

It would be particularly unfortunate if the measures taken by this, or any, government were such as to hinder, rather than assist, the efforts of other countries in dealing with this problem. It should be recognized that in case of a serious threat of unemployment there is likely to be a strong pressure for the use of methods which would attempt to create employment at the expense of other nations. These methods would clearly be self-defeating in character, and tend ultimately to worsen, rather than improve, the employment situation in all countries.

Because of the necessary impact of a domestic full employment program upon our foreign economic relations, there are certain principles which I think should be borne in mind in the drafting of any final legislation on this subject, and in the working out of a specific program. For instance, attempts to create full employment at home, by the stimulation of uneconomic production, would clearly lessen the volume of beneficial foreign trade which we might otherwise enjoy. Similarly, if a full employment program is to provide the maximum material well-being for our people, it should rely substantially on foreign trade and investment as a means of providing employment opportunities. Finally, it would be unfortunate if a domestic full employment program should introduce added rigidities into our economy and thus lead to new restrictions and controls on foreign trade. As you realize, other nations in the past have attempted to further domestic economic programs by resorting to exchange controls, import quotas, and other devices destructive of international economic collaboration.

You will be interested to know that the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy is now studying the international aspects of the full employment problem, including the effect of various possible types of domestic full employment programs upon our foreign economic relations.

The Department has not been informed as to the relationship of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

Edw. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
December 29, 1944.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: As requested in your letter of December 16, I have examined the draft bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment (Confidential Subcommittee Print No. 1, dated December 11, 1944) and have given thought to the approach taken therein. I hope that my comments, which are set forth below, may prove helpful to you in the development of a bill for the consideration of the next Congress.

Permit me to congratulate you on having initiated and given impetus to the legislative effort to deal with the formidable problem of involuntary unemployment. There has developed a realization that it is the responsibility of governments to provide an economic framework which will minimize the dislocations that lead to depression and to intervene directly to maintain employment opportunities when other measures fail. At the International Labor Conference in Philadelphia the United States Government accepted and sponsored the principle that each government recognizes its duty to maintain a high level of employment. All other governments present, as well as the worker and employer delegates, joined in voting for a resolution that this principle should be incorporated in the peace settlements. Although there has been an increasing public recognition of this responsibility in the United States, there has not yet been sufficient legislative consideration of the problems involved to result in the framing of legislation.

Much of the structure and content of the bill under consideration appears to me to be highly commendable. The introduction of the concept of the National Production and Employment Budget, with its primary emphasis upon the level of total expenditure necessary to buy the total volume of goods and services that would be produced at the levels of employment contemplated, I consider a constructive contribution. I believe the proposal to establish a joint committee on the Budget, composed of members from

six existing Senate and House committees concerned with financial matters, is fully deserving of congressional study. Many other passages in the proposed measure seem to me to be admirably conceived.

The relatively brief period of time available for study of your bill has not been sufficient to enable me to formulate and prepare for you final comments. I am attaching, however, a memorandum prepared for me by A. F. Hinrichs, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, which sets forth a number of considerations germane to the problems dealt with by your proposal which may be of value to your committee. Your immediate objective appears to be to open the problem and its means of solution for discussion. This the introduction of your bill accomplishes. Any reservations I may have would not be germane to the next step which I presume will be taken, namely, a series of hearings and studies of the devices that can be used to achieve the main objective, maximum employment.

Please call freely upon me and the staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for assistance. The Department of Labor exists "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." No measure could possibly contribute as much to this objective as an act which would assure "continuing full employment."

Due to the limited period of time afforded me for the preparation of these comments I have been unable to ascertain the relationship of your proposal to the legislative program of the President.

Sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
December 28, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment" is a proposal of real importance and significance. Any proposal to relate our Federal fiscal policies to our national economy in such a way as to maintain full employment and insure high levels of business activity is worthy of our deepest consideration. Such a proposal is of equal significance to all segments of our economy, including agriculture.

As I have stated many times before congressional committees and elsewhere, the first essential to solving post-war farm problems is maintaining full industrial production and employment of workers, because farmers sell and will continue to sell most of what they produce on the domestic market. Only through full employment at good wages can they have plenty of customers able to pay fair prices for their products.

The consequences of widespread unemployment in this country in the post-war period could well prove to be detrimental not only to the welfare of our citizens who are unemployed, but would be most costly to the rest of our people and to the Federal Government itself. As a matter of fact, another depression might strike at the very foundation of our entire political economy.

We have not had time to make a detailed analysis of your proposed bill. However, insofar as the objectives and the general approach of the bill are concerned the proposal offers possibilities with which we are in complete sympathy. It is my hope that you will perfect and introduce this bill in order that it may be given fullest consideration. At a later date we will be happy to testify or present evidence based upon our further study and analysis of the measure.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
January 9, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have studied with unusual interest the draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuous full employment."

When the war is over all of us will turn our hands and minds to the creation of a new and vastly more prosperous America. Full employment at good wages, a better income and a better life for farmers, reasonable profits for businessmen, and security and opportunity for all—these will be the things toward which all of us will work.

The world we live in when the peace finally comes will be an unsettled world—potentially a revolutionary world. If we in America are to carry our full share of responsibility for stability in international affairs, we must have a strong and prosperous economy here at home.

We must make our system work effectively and efficiently in the interests of all of us. We must fully employ all our resources and all our manpower to raise our standards of living, to provide good jobs, vastly improved housing, medical care, and education for every family in the land. If we fail to do this, our system will have failed, and America will have failed to carry out its full responsibility for world economic leadership.

Much the greatest opportunity for expanding production and employment rests with free private enterprise. I am sure that the leaders of industry, labor, and agriculture will do everything within their power to bring about the fullest possible employment of our labor and other resources. But, in the last analysis, only the Federal Government, I believe, can assure the conditions under which free private enterprise can operate most effectively.

I therefore strongly favor the assumption of this responsibility by the Federal Government through legislation carefully drawn and fully debated by the Congress. The draft bill to establish a program for assuring full use of our resources of productive power and of manpower seems to me to be intelligent and practical steps toward carrying out this principle.

The construction of a national production and employment budget for our economy would, I think, represent an important advance in governmental and business planning and policy determination. The proposal to estimate each year the full employment capacity of the Nation and to set off against that capacity the consumption, investment, and normal governmental expenditures which actually are expected in that year is an excellent means of determining the required additional expenditures, private and governmental, which are needed to assure full employment. This method, I believe, is more practical than any proposal to set rigid limits upon the volume of aggregate investment expenditure which would balance our savings at full employment, year in and year out.

The National Budget principle also has the merit of focusing the attention of Congress and the executive agencies, as well as business and the general public, upon the several types of program by means of which aggregate expenditures on goods and services can be increased. I particularly like the provision that programs having the effect of increasing consumption and private investment should be thoroughly canvassed before additional Federal expenditures are resorted to.

Business investment should be stimulated in every reasonable way. New ventures should be encouraged, while monopolies should be sharply curbed.

Unless our businessmen are encouraged to move out aggressively to create new industries, to modernize old industries, and to seek expanding markets, both at home and

abroad, we cannot expect our economy to function fully in the public interest.

However, under the best of circumstances there will be occasions when the full investment necessary to provide full use of our productive capacity will not be forthcoming from private and normal governmental sources. Under these circumstances, the firm assurance that the Federal Government will provide the necessary additional expenditures to maintain markets is essential. For this reason, I am glad to see that the commitment of the Government to step in during the years when private expenditures fall short is clear and unambiguous.

All enterprises undertaken by the Government should, of course, be projects useful in their own right. There should be no unnecessary leaf raking or boondoggling. There are, however, almost unlimited projects of obvious social value which could be included in a long-range public-works program.

A firm commitment by Government to devote to useful public projects any portion of our national resources which would otherwise run to waste in idleness should actually minimize the contribution which the Federal Government will have to make to keep total national expenditures, public and private, up to full employment levels.

It will do this, I believe, by inducing consumers to spend more freely because of greater assurance of stability of jobs and income; by inspiring confidence on the part of business in the adequacy and stability of its future markets; and by assuring State and municipal governments dependable and growing bases on which to finance desirable improvement projects.

The success of such a program requires, of course, that the Federal Government shall have planned well in advance a useful program of public projects, carefully integrated with State and local public works, which could, if necessary, be set in motion on short notice. It would also require vastly improved reporting of the volume of actual and prospective private and State and local government capital expenditure. In this connection, it appears desirable to give closer attention than is explicitly provided in the bill to regional distribution of employment and expenditures.

I hope the bill will be fully discussed by the Congress. Public hearings, with testimony by Government officials and representatives of business, agriculture, and labor, and by other interested persons should contribute greatly to public understanding of the problems which lie ahead of us in peacetime and the best means of their solution.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
December 29, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Let me acknowledge your letter of December 16, asking for my comments about subcommittee print No. 1 of a draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment." This will also supplement the acknowledgment of even date of Commissioner Ferguson of the Federal Housing Administration to your letter to him of December 22 on the same subject.

Upon reading this interesting bill, its contents seem to me to lie within that area of broadest general policy where the Congress itself is best equipped to make judgments. If the bill were to be enacted, its operations would, of course, affect the Government as a whole and the country as a whole; but the bill contains no technical materials presently which are peculiar to the problems and experience of the National Housing Agency.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, and reiterating that the content of the bill is within the realm of high policy, my comment, briefly, is as follows:

The objective of full employment, sought first and primarily through the medium of private enterprise, secondly, through public stimulation and assistance to private enterprise, and thirdly, by useful and necessary supplementary programs financed in whole or in part by the Government, is an objective upon which there is now fairly common agreement. It will interest you to know that the National Housing Agency, in its thinking about post-war housing, is pursuing these three lines of approach in the order and emphasis listed. Of course, our estimates of post-war housing need are based upon the consumer need for housing as well as upon the amount of housing construction required to contribute appropriately toward full employment.

Practically all of the policies and activities of the Government, as defined by law, have some direct or indirect effect upon the success of the country in achieving the objective of full employment under our present system of democracy and initiative. Therefore, machinery designed to focus governmental activity more clearly and dramatically upon this objective and to coordinate it more thoroughly toward this end at the highest policy level, seems to me very desirable. It also seems to me that the kind of focus and coordination at the high policy level, which the draft bill emphasizes, is even more important than detailed reorganization of existing governmental agencies.

In short, the draft bill deals with our most important problem next to winning the war and the making of a permanent peace, and I think that the provisions of the bill are well thought out. As to whether the mechanics of operation which the draft bill contemplates are the best available methods for the accomplishment of the objective, that would seem to me to be a matter within the province of the Congress and the Chief Executive rather than mine.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that it has no objection to the submission of this report on the draft bill.

Thanking you for the request that I comment upon this draft bill, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. BLANDFORD, JR.
Administrator.

DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS AND WORLD PEACE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the subject upon which I am about to speak is one I have approached with extreme caution and gravity, realizing fully my role as an American legislator charged with the most solemn duties in what may be the most solemn hour of our Republic. For what is being done and written today concerning a post-war organization of the world by which the peace is to be kept will determine more than any other one thing the fate of our great country. And it is certain to determine the extent of our prosperity, the type of institutions we are to have, and whether in the years to come millions of American mothers are again to weep over the memory of brave sons buried on foreign battlefields their graves marked only by a white crosses.

Mr. President, I shudder—and I use the word advisedly—I shudder to think what will happen to the United States and to civilization itself if the present effort to build a community of nations within the framework of a durable peace does not

succeed. I refer to the efforts now being made to create what in effect will be a new League of Nations as symbolized by the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks.

I say these things with the deliberation of a man who is much saddened by the need that forces him to speak. For, Mr. President, we are not on our way to peace. We are following a formula which will lead to certain and even more terrible wars in the future.

Dumbarton Oaks, I believe, or any agreement drawn up on similar premises, is ultimately doomed to failure. I state this not as a personal opinion. It is simply a matter of inevitable cause and effect, based on equally inevitable facts.

I believe, on the other hand, that there is a program which, in this modern world, can succeed, and may maintain the peace. This, too, is not stated as a personal opinion. It is a studied conclusion, again based on an objective analysis of the facts, facts which, if anyone wishes to read them in complete detail, can be found in the brilliant work, *The Gentlemen Talk of Peace*, by William B. Ziff, a work to which I shall again refer.

I feel that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are the product of a noble and humanitarian point of view. I think it will be accepted by his friends and foes alike that this effort by the President of the United States to create a world organization of peace-loving nations is the product of a desire to see a final end to this terrible business of war. As loyal patriots in this crisis, we have followed our Commander in Chief and have given his program every opportunity to prove itself. Those of us who have been in the Republican opposition feel that on this most important of all issues there has been no other choice to make, and that the President of the United States must in this emergency face the world equipped with a single American mandate—with a united nation behind it.

When in the course of events it becomes clear, however, that the proposals espoused by the President of the United States and the American State Department are based on a totally mistaken estimate of events, and that the result will be to lessen rather than to increase the security of this country in the world of the future, then it becomes equally necessary that we demand a new course, a course in which a proper and judicious mixture of realism is intermingled with the elements of hope and of humanitarian doctrine.

That time may now have arrived. There is little use in deluding ourselves further. The set of ideas on which the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is based cannot succeed. I, for one, hope that they will succeed, and that I am wrong in this estimate, but for reasons which I shall shortly outline for the consideration of Senators, I am prepared to say now that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals not only cannot succeed, they will never be placed into effect even provisionally. This is now perfectly clear to those who can read the signs of the times which are emblazoned on the very heavens. They are as plain as a pikestaff to those with eyes

to see that we are now at what may be the greatest turning point in human history.

I should like to caution the Members of the Senate that this is no longer a matter of party view. It is no longer a matter of saving face for those who may have mistakenly espoused a program which now turns out to be a sorry illusion. It is a matter, fellow Senators, of national life or death.

This is not an academic question concerned with protocol or questions of ordinary political maneuver. This is a question which has already been written in the blood of over half a million American boys and may yet be sealed with the blood of hundreds of thousands more. It is a question which involves the destruction of our property, the wastage of our national resources, and the blasting of the very nature of the institution by which our Republic is to be governed.

In the last World War 10,000,000 men met death on the battlefield. Another 21,000,000 were wounded, in addition to other millions who were listed as missing. Wartime conditions brought about as many as 30,000,000 of other deaths among the civilian population.

The economic and physical costs of this terrific orgy of blood-letting have been estimated as high as \$338,000,000,000.

These figures are appalling enough, but they are minor in comparison to what is now occurring. Let me quote from Mr. Ziff's work:

In addition to the millions who will have been killed on the battlefields when the present struggle is terminated, untold legions will have been permanently crippled, great masses of men will emerge maimed in mind and spirit as well as in body. In military casualties the Germans alone have lost close to 5,000,000 men; the Russians, perhaps 7,500,000; the Chinese, 4,500,000; and the Japanese, somewhere around 2,000,000. The civilian deaths due to the war are upwards of 13,000,000 for China and 11,000,000 for the Soviet Union. Over 3,000,000 Jews have been exterminated by Germany in the abattoirs of Poland. The Poles must have lost among all classes of citizens as many as 4,000,000. At least 40,000,000 people of all nationalities have been torn up by their roots in Europe and perhaps as many as 30,000,000 in Asia. Uncounted millions will have been destroyed by epidemics and disabled by wounds or starvation. The figures of those afflicted with soul-sickness and dangerous psychoses will dwarf completely those of any other war in history.

It is pointed out that—

Without taking into account imponderable losses of economic destruction, the actual cost of the present war was probably over \$500,000,000,000 by the beginning of 1944. The United States alone was spending money at the rate of \$276,000,000 a day.

In the over-all global cost, World War No. 2 will probably run into the fabulous sum of two thousand billion dollars. Even in these days of astronomical figures this amount staggers the imagination. It is not merely a figure, Mr. President, but it represents steel and coal and oil, chemicals, and a vast accumulation of human energy and effort. It represents a wastage of what should be the inalienable possession of the peoples of the world and the heritage of our unborn children. It spells for the next gen-

eration the heavy threat of financial ruin, and promises them the economics of scarcity instead of plenty. It does not take into consideration unseen costs which are virtually measureless. How shall we replace, for example, the minerals from our soil which are now sent so freely to Europe and Asia in the shape of food products, plastics, and other materials derived from agriculture?

A study of these appalling facts should make it clear to anyone that we can no longer dally with the present emergency. We cannot dance after some new Pied Piper of Hamelin.

Impassioned zealots, no matter how noble their motives, may in this emergency prove dangerous to our Republic despite—and I say this after studied thought—despite the fact that they are situated in high places.

Within a short time the President of the United States will again meet in discussion with the Prime Minister of the British Empire and with our other ally, Marshal Stalin, head of all the Russias.

Let us cut away the obscuring cover of fine phrases which hides the real object of this meeting from view. That real object is plain to all of us—it is how to save the peace after it has been won, how to keep the United Nations still united when the war is over.

The misgivings with which the future may well be faced are pointedly brought to our attention by the situation in Europe, for the principal members of the United Nations are now following policies which have little to do with that mutual cooperation so desperately required by humanity which has already endured far more war and blood-letting than it can stand.

The meeting between the three great statesmen is not intended as a pleasant session of routine discussions. It is intended as a desperate effort to mend differences which are now all but unbridgeable.

If this meeting does not succeed, and it appears to me perfectly clear that it will not, then we must start all over again in our efforts to find a basis for a common peace.

Let us survey the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and look into the practical and realistic reasons why they fly in the face of fate.

No matter how one looks at it, the plan is for a new League of Nations—only this time a league with teeth in it. This means we must have a world set-up embracing some 66 independent states and several more, such as Iraq, which are presumably on their way toward independence.

Of these three-score and six independent states, only four are in a position which could possibly enable them to meet the problems of the present century. Great Britain, unfortunately, is not one of these four. The four are the United States of America, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the Republic of China, and the United States of Brazil. I include the latter country in the category of potential masters of the globe since it fits the circumstances by which tomorrow's power pattern is to be measured. All Brazil lacks today is people.

I remind the Senate that it was Mr. Ziff who wrote that other great realistic work which so strongly influenced our Nation at another critical moment early in the war. It was called *The Coming Battle of Germany*. His new work is, I think, of even greater importance to the American people. My attention was called to it some 5 months ago when together with others I had the privilege of seeing it in galley form. We can judge the future by the past. During these months I have stood by and waited to see the developments and have been literally amazed to note with what exactness the forecasts made by him have come true. He stated, for example, that the Atlantic Charter would not be backed up by its authors and would be quietly abandoned; that the Soviet Union would install the Lublin committee by unilateral action as the rule of Poland; that our foreign policy would force De Gaulle into the lap of the Soviet Union. He described the situation in Greece in detail and predicted with accuracy the subsequent struggle which has taken place there between the ELAS resistance forces and the British.

Almost in the words subsequently used by Prime Minister Churchill, he forecast that the United Nations would seek to compensate Poland for the territory lost to the Soviet Union by giving her East Prussia and those portions of the Reich east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers, and that the Germans would be removed from these territories by a great population exchange. He forecast the view of the War Crimes Commission set up by the United Nations, which has now finally declined to carry out the previous threats to try German leaders criminally. His statement of the Chinese situation and other situations generally have been coming true day by day with uncanny accuracy.

My attention was further called to all this by a large number of editorials which have been appearing day by day in the various newspapers throughout the country, as well as in my own section. These newspaper editorials have emphasized the things which I have noted and which I express here. Among them is an editorial from a newspaper which has won the Pulitzer prize for the excellence of its editorials, namely, the *Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune*, which not only typifies the highest standard of journalism throughout the Nation but also the way the people of our section of the country are beginning to think. In one of these editorials to which I refer the *Bismarck Tribune* states that unless we elect to do something now, there most certainly will be another war. It calls attention to the fact that "the nature and extent of that war is indicated with probable accuracy by William B. Ziff in his new book, *The Gentlemen Talk of Peace*."

I have noted the editorials of such representative newspapers as the *Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel*, the *Jackson (Miss.) News*, the *Evansville (Ind.) Courier*, the *Topeka (Kans.) State Journal*, the *Pontiac (Mich.) Press*, the *Denver (Colo.) Post*, the *Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democratic Times*, the *Birming-*

ham (Ala.) Age-Herald, and scores of other newspapers, large and small.

The opinions expressed by these publications are not the opinions of people in a few large cities, they are the views of the average run of people of the United States; they are the grass-roots reactions; they are the expressions which you and I must heed if we are to feel the actual pulse of our country and know what the common man is now really thinking.

There is an indication that the people in the grass-roots part of the country at least are becoming confused and angry at all this fumbling and juggling of our national requirements for future peace.

They know, too, the promise on which the Dumbarton Oaks plan is based, and that the small countries like Finland and scores of others are no longer living organisms in terms of the post-war future, and that they will not exist as sovereign entities maintaining their own armies, navies, currency, and diplomatic corps.

Let us take Bulgaria as a single example so that we may see this condition outlined in clear terms. How can such a state discharge the obligations of a modern manufacturing and trading power? It obviously cannot. An independent political fragment, it cannot be compared in terms of organized social strength with such a state as the vital and self-contained United States of America, or the Soviet Union. Such national independence no longer makes sense in terms of economic production, trade, or military relations.

Such states will be forever at the mercy of their larger neighbors. If they are not conquered by force of arms, they will be conquered economically, and perhaps ideologically as well. They are no longer free agents, a fact which we are compelled to consider in our estimate of the nature of the world in which we live.

For we are living in the midst not only of war, but of a tremendous international revolution which derives its force from the great changes technology has brought about. Yesterday Bulgaria could manufacture muskets, or even cannon, as well as any other state. It could attend to the wants of its citizens as easily as could the largest nation, and, if attacked, might hold up the invader for many months until help could reach it.

Today, none of this is the case. Today, in the air age, a small state cannot resist invasion for more than a matter of hours, or, at most, days. Every new invention places it at an increasing disadvantage. Does anyone dream, for example, that Bulgaria can manufacture and mass-produce airplanes, motor cars, and the other paraphernalia of a modern civilization at war or at peace, with the same capacity as the United States or of the Soviet Union?

These are the physical facts which must be considered.

England itself, in the long-term future, will no longer be a great and powerful state, but a small island nation precariously situated off the edge of Europe. If Europe is totally held by a single power, war will find England in grave

danger, cut off from her resources in Asia and the South Seas exactly as if she did not possess them. We had some warning of this in the current struggle, when Great Britain was deprived of the rubber of Malaya and the East Indies, exactly as the United States was cut off, although these territories were the physical property of Britain. In the air age such a separation from the sources of material power can prove fatal. Military men tell me that if Europe were held by a single power it would be literally possible to "Pearl Harbor" Great Britain overnight.

The era of finance power also is declining, a circumstance which will prove extremely hurtful to Britain and her future.

I am not an aviation expert. I only present the views of one of the ablest experts in this country. Mr. Ziff argues—and the future will determine whether he is right—

Our interest in the British situation would arise alone from a single fact which cannot be ignored—geographically, strategically, Great Britain is to us as the eye is to the human brain and the human nervous system. It is an extension of our primary economy. If Great Britain were to go down or to be attached to Europe, the whole chain of island defenses which now secures our hemisphere against assault, would disappear. The situation will be very clear when I point out the great ease with which we are able to attack the Germans without any real possibility of retaliation in kind against us. If Great Britain were in the possession of a hostile Europe, the shoe would be on the other foot, and it would be we who would be under attack. And then, too, there is her Dominion, Canada, with her 3,000 miles of contiguous territory.

To return to the analysis of the real situation which exists, of the four potential masters of the globe, there are only two which fit the conditions under which power can be held. One of these is the United States of America. The other is Soviet Russia. It is these two states alone which can determine whether there is to be war or peace and who will finally decide under what conditions the new world order of tomorrow is to be effected.

I do not urge that we ignore the other states of the world. Quite the contrary. I think that they and their interests must be intimately consulted, but that they cannot be consulted on the basis of the type of organization which has been projected by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. This is only because such an organization cannot exist side by side with the present unequal grouping of sovereign states, with their power politics and partisan hopes and views.

Those who are attempting to implement the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will assert that they will put an end to power politics, and an end to national partisanships, by the creation of world courts and world agreements of various kinds. They admit that none of this worked in reference to the last League, but this time they are going to add force in the shape of police power to compel law-breakers and criminal nations to keep the peace.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the creation of an international police force is a

virtual impossibility. Even if it were created, as Mr. Ziff says:

The terminal results would be nothing else than the erection of a world superstate. Whoever controlled this world police force would control the globe, irrespective of constitutions or fine legalisms which might be written into the international law. The police force itself would immediately become an object of intrigue and conspiracy, with various groups and states trying to muscle themselves into absolute control. It would form a new Praetorian Guard which would establish itself finally as the ruling caste.

This is pretty well understood today, and the diplomats no longer argue the point. What they do argue, however, is that the world itself can be divided into spheres of influence in which the major states will exercise police power.

I am utterly amazed at the naïveté and innocence which prompt such fantastic beliefs as this. If it is possible, for example, for one large state to police a number of small states, who do you think will be the final boss? How do you think the small states will vote, for example, at the councils of the League? Is it your idea that they will vote against the boss when the boss has both the military weight and the legal right to suddenly come in upon them on one pretext or another and throw the existing regime out on its ear?

Did we not see every evidence of this in the German penetration of central Europe and the Balkans? The Germans took Austria, Hungary, Rumania, and the other states of that region by diplomatic, ideological, and economic means, long before they attached them to the Axis as military appendages. Germany was the big market for its small agrarian neighbors. It supplied them with manufactured goods, and by its control of the money exchange it had the little states always waiting hat in hand, humble supplicants before their wealthy overlord.

This is a situation which, as Mr. Ziff describes it—

can hardly be altered by some international code which all parties are bound to respect. Any theory of industrial equalization or guaranteed access to markets and raw materials by all countries is compelled to assume a limitation of sovereignty on the part of each state over its own territory. This would mean the end of the state itself and a new social order. As long as the present political divisions exist there are no controls which can be instituted which would have the slightest real effect.

In addition, I should mention another fact. In competition for markets the dictatorial state possesses—ominously for us, Mr. President—immeasurable advantages over a free nation like the United States. A dictator's mere presence as a competitor is sure to involve manipulations, subsidies, and concealed discriminations completely destructive to the law of free enterprise which presumably governs the international market.

For example, let us take one of our largest corporations, such as the Standard Oil Co. In competition with a dictatorial state, the Standard Oil Co. would be as a pigmy compared to a giant. The Standard Oil Co. is, after all, in business to make money. It is not an extension of the State Department of the

United States of America. It cannot be given surreptitious orders by the American military.

But a comparable trade organization, in the hands of a dictatorial state, could easily have other objectives than those of pure trade. Its objectives need not be to make money. They might easily be political, or even military. In any competition, the dictatorial state is able to employ its own kind of bookkeeping, depending upon what the goals are, a condition which our largest corporation could hardly meet.

I tell you this because I would like to make it clear that, in any competition between ourselves and a large authoritarian state for control of the smaller nations—a competition which, incidentally, is certain to go forward, as it did before this war—in such a competition it is we who will lose, since the authoritarian state will begin the struggle with overpowering advantages.

The author states that—

Each of the major countries involved in the so-called new League of Nations will be concerned with a totally different set of national problems and goals. England cannot give up India without volcanic results in her material situation. China cannot yield on the question of industrialization of the East. The Soviets must seek outlets on warm water. The western states must gaze with frank misgivings on Soviet control of the Balkans, whether by military occupation or by the indirect domination of so-called "friendly" governments.

And he poses the inescapable fact which we have been hesitant to mention—

The instant the Soviet Union sits on the blue waters of the Adriatic it occupies an impregnable military position, outflanking all that remains of Europe. Europe then would be impossible to hold, should the Soviets determine to devour it.

Let me digress for a minute at this point. I am not anti-Soviet. I am not anti-anything. I am only pro-the United States and pro-peace. I think it would be tragic if through our ignorance of the circumstances now operating in the world, events should finally throw us willy-nilly into conflict with the Soviet Union or any of our other great international neighbors.

I, for one, wish all people in the world well. I see no reason why, if we realistically face the facts, we should not be able to create a new and workable world order in which all of us will be able to retain the institutions to which we are attached and which are part of the tradition and historic views we hold as a people.

Returning to the question of a new League of Nations, it is ridiculous to assume that there will be any free agents in the world, independent of the conditions of power by which the future will be organized. For instance, Mr. President, we now recognize the independent existence of the three Baltic countries, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Can anyone doubt that these countries will in the real sense become a portion of the Soviet Union itself, irrespective of whether they continue on the map as allegedly independent states? Who, then, will govern their foreign views and their

voting at any council of states? Who do you think governs that of Iraq, if not Great Britain? And who do you think governs that of Cuba or Nicaragua, if not the United States of America? The idea of their free and independent voting is a fiction which can only in the end lead to the gravest trouble.

It is proposed that there be five great states which will rule the world and sit in the central council of the League, the camouflaged power body which is to determine how events are finally to shape themselves. One of these is the United States; another is Soviet Russia. A third is the Republic of France. France has been ruined and desperately hurt by this war, and apparently is well within the Russian sphere of influence. No ruler in France today can afford to ignore the fact that a single dominant power is emerging on the European Continent, and that the major political party of the French State is now the Communist Party.

Another state is China. The condition of China again becomes one of peculiar and particular interest to us. Let us again face the realities. China and Britain must be at loggerheads in the world of the future. China is a state of approximately 500,000,000 people. The demographers, or students of population increase, tell us that by 1970 China may have a population of 800,000,000, granted that it is allowed to industrialize and to introduce modern methods of sanitation and feeding. An industrialized China of these dimensions, cooped up in narrow coastal areas, will look hungrily toward the south, where are located the great rice-bearing fields inhabited by a kindred people and now in the possession of western nations, principally the British. When 8,000,000 people die of starvation alone in a single year on the Yellow River, we can be certain that Chinese policy will gravitate inexorably toward the rice-bearing areas of Burma, Indochina, and Thailand. The Chinese also will look hungrily toward the islands of the East Indies—empty, rich paradises with immense stores of raw materials, well capable of absorbing perhaps several hundred million settlers. In the air age, these lands can no longer be protected by a far-away island citadel.

If we do not understand in advance the realities of the power forms of tomorrow, it may be deemed certain that the people of many other states do. We have never had to compete in terms of power politics in the past while others have. The net result is what we have seen in Europe, where the British and the Russians are quietly at each others' throats in an effort to enforce their conception of the future upon the populations of strategically situated European and Asiatic countries.

I believe it is perfectly plain that the British, in their endeavor to install antiquated machinery of government in the shape of monarchial regimes throughout Europe, are not going to succeed. They will fail. The power of the present revolutionary situation in Europe is certain to defeat them. The small, modern state is no longer economically sound.

The British—and ourselves, if we support British policy—will find themselves guilty of the greatest of all political crimes, namely, failure. To the emaciated people of Europe, again to quote Mr. Ziff, "racked in body, sick of the world they live in, humiliated by the very conditions of existence, the declarations of our diplomatic leaders will seem empty and unattractive."

At the best, Europeans will be badly confused as to our purposes and our capacity to wield power. We may even find ourselves in league with the remnants of the old reactionary regimes against the underground groups, a result which would mean a major tragedy to our policy and bankruptcy to American diplomacy.

This type of intervention cannot fail to throw Europe directly into the hands of the extreme radical elements, as was the case when the western nations so mistakenly intervened in Russia after the last war in an effort to crush the rising Communist state. They succeeded only in hardening resistance, and in making certain the success of the Communist state.

Under the Dumbarton Oaks scheme, as it is now envisaged, the struggle for control must go forward. It is inevitable, as it is also, in my judgment, inevitable that we would lose it.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of Dumbarton Oaks is the reliance upon force and power to keep alive an antiquated world. When I say an antiquated world, I mean a world whose political forms have become outmoded, a world of small, archaic states no longer able to fulfill the functions of government, of trade, of manufacture, and defense in relation to their citizens. The result of this hodgepodge can be only a continuation of the old struggle for control, this time under different auspices and under cover of a new League of Nations. The smaller state cannot be an aggressor any more, and the larger state will have been given the moral authority to dominate and conquer its neighbors.

Every American must realize that the grave danger, in or outside of Dumbarton Oaks, with its unrealistic attitude toward the world, is that whoever controls the Eurasian land mass is the potential master of the globe. In short, let us put it in this way: If a single power is able to control Europe, that single power may also be able to control Asia. It certainly will control Africa. It will then have in its possession more than nine-tenths of the population of the world, and a similar proportion of the world's physical resources. Look at the world as a whole, and it will be seen that under those circumstances the United States would be the center of what the military men call a double-envelopment movement. It would virtually be surrounded on all sides. Instead of the great oceans protecting us, we would find Asia only 56 miles away from the northernmost tip of North America. The great hump of Brazil would be nearer to Old World Africa than to the United States.

Those are physical circumstances which we cannot omit examining. The United States is the richest country, the

greatest prize in the world for any future conqueror. It therefore is the one with the most to lose. It must consider most carefully its relationship to the future in terms of the new facts which have arisen. Either we are going to be able to make a world organization which will work, or we are going to be forced to face the future in such terms as to prevent the creation in the world of any single power overwhelmingly larger than we, or capable of greater potential military and economic strength than our own. To do less than this would be to court disaster.

In chapter after chapter, Mr. Ziff's book traces the ineffectuality of peace treaties in the past. At no time in history have any of the treaties and arrangements which have been made to keep the peace lasted longer than the expediencies of the nations involved. No matter what agreements were arrived at, they were always vacated by the national need or by the arrival of some new political factor or ruler. I challenge anyone to show a single arrangement which, though solemnly entered into, has been lasting. National morality in the long run has always been determined by the national need. One has only to look at the way in which we entered Iran. I do not criticize it. I approve. Similarly, we occupied Iceland and Greenland though they were the properties of a sovereign who was friendly to us. His country was occupied by Nazi armies. I refer, of course, to good King Christian of Denmark.

Despite the fine phrases which have been uttered in reference to Dumbarton Oaks, no concert of powers in history has started out with poorer prospects than this one. Everyone came together and mouthed fine legalisms, but when put to the first test of strength, Dumbarton Oaks shows itself even more flimsy than the previous concert of Europe, which originated in Berlin; or its successor, the late and unlamented League of Nations.

We find the Soviet Union, for example, asserting its willingness to agree to an arrangement, but its unwillingness to allow itself to be policed in case it should be adjudged in the wrong. This, of course, would make a complete farce of any proceeding. We note the Soviet Union refusing to attend the important aviation conference in Chicago on the plea that one of the attending powers, the Swiss Republic, was in reality Fascist. At the same conference we find Great Britain insisting on the creation of international cartels, which, in effect, would freeze the carrying trade of the world. The United States, to its credit, refused to agree, which, of course, meant no agreement whatsoever.

At every turn in the game we see exactly the same result—no agreement. We have noted the Soviet Union and Great Britain struggling with each other over the potential spoils in Europe, a struggle, which as I have stated, is certain to end in British discomfiture. The supporting factors which lend themselves to victory in this struggle are no longer in British control.

It is almost hopeless to believe that we are going to be able to make a Dumbarton Oaks world. Such a league would

be based on the most erroneous of all assumptions, that it is going to be possible to create a practical league of nations independent of the terms of the peace conference itself.

This separation from the stream of power facts which dominate the physical affairs of the world can only confine the deliberations within a vacuum and condemn them to sterility. The discussions can be little more than diplomatic shadow boxing and reflect only the exigencies of underlying power politics.

It is dangerous to expect that one can ignore the real factors which are operating in the world, and yet still achieve a successful peace. It is useless to believe, for example, that the Soviet Union can be excluded from warm water ports on all the big oceans by some type of arrangement or agreement, or that Russia will fail to take advantage of its present opportunities to make the Soviet State secure in all directions—in short, to make its position in all respects an invulnerable one. One can hardly blame the Soviet Union for this. Nor can we expect that the shrewd, practical-minded leaders of the Soviet will recede from this position for the sake of the legal Dumbarton Oaks obscurities. In my opinion, it is a certainty that the Soviet Union wants the Dardanelles and intends to have them. This may constitute a problem of the first magnitude which will have to be solved in some way. It is simply purblind for us to ignore this very real element behind the aspirations of the U. S. S. R.

In the same breath it must be stated that Great Britain will not allow its entire physical position to crumble without some proper alternative being offered it. If the imperial world is to collapse, Britain will be a poor nation and perhaps militarily weak as well, unless some method can be found to refit it into a reorganized world. Until such a method is forthcoming, it is certain that the British people, led by their able Prime Minister, will bend every possible effort to make their own position secure, even if it means the use of the terrifying expedients now to be observed in Greece, Italy, and elsewhere.

The same condition goes for China, and for all the other elements which go to make up the world economy. These are the real, the physical elements which exist, and Mr. President, I warn that they can be ignored only at our own peril.

If there is to be a world league which is to keep the peace and to keep the nations of the earth from each other's throats, the time to create it is now. Decisions are being made now by the unilateral action of the powers. The time for palaver is past. If we and the other nations believe in an international league which in some fashion is to keep the peace, the agreements must be made at once. If this cannot be achieved, the Dumbarton Oaks plan must be junked as a diplomatic blunder, and we must reorient our thinking all over again.

We might start by reasoning that though we have already won one world war and undoubtedly will win this one, a third such victory would well-nigh ruin us.

The men who worked at Dumbarton Oaks are unquestionably skilled in diplomacy. They are unquestionably, as is the President of the United States, sincere. So, I believe, are leaders and peace delegates of all of the nations. I think they and all the people are desperately sick of these recurring disasters and would like to see a final end to them. There is, in my judgment, a way by which this can be done. The general outlines to that way have been pointed up briefly in this discussion and in detail by Mr. Ziff.

In my opinion and in the opinion of others in this Congress who have yet to make themselves heard, some such proposal as suggested, represents an alternative to pure isolationism to those who oppose Dumbarton Oaks. If the Dumbarton Oaks plan cannot work, to them pure isolationism is no more satisfactory and will in the end they feel see us disastrously hurt. The great fault with Dumbarton Oaks is the great fault of Versailles.

Without exception the authors of these plans seek the benefits of a peaceful world, but are unwilling to create the conditions which would guarantee it. Their poor, blind caution and conventional old-line diplomacy suffer from that gravest of faults: It is unrealistic. Realism now demands that an end be put to the grab-bag of small states, and that the world be reorganized along lines of the sound, modern economy.

The small state today is merely a battleground in which the bigger states can compete. It serves no useful purpose. A modern, living state must have the capacity to fulfill all functions in reference to its citizens. It must be able to defend them and to provide the raw materials required in industry as well as the electric power and other spurces of industrial strength. This means it must stretch over a wide area, reaching into tropic, semitropic, and temperate climes. It must have great space like the Soviet Union so that if it is attacked, it can fall back. It must possess decentralized sources of manufacture, as did the Russians. If the Russian industrial region had ended at the Leningrad-Moscow-Stalingrad line, Russia would today be a vassal of the German Empire.

If the world could be consolidated into a number of regions, each of comparatively equal size, the impulse to war would largely be at an end. None of these regions would be so small as to make attack attractive. Each would possess the resources and the internal market which would make them largely self-sufficient and able to get along with each other.

The world breaks down naturally into such great regional areas, which Mr. Ziff refers to as "power aggregates."

War between them would not be inviting—

He points out—

and would logically be resorted to only under the most extreme provocation. The differences of these regional units with each other could be resolved by simple agreement since they would no longer be complicated by the fears, suspicions, and temptations provided in the present political splintering of the world.

Thus we would settle at their source all the dangerous questions which unite to create international instability, derangement, dislocation, and disorder. We would create a system of regionalism which would be sane, rational, and genuinely globalist in character.

It is of the gravest importance to us that, whether the world can be so constituted or not, some such arrangement be made in reference to the entire west. By the west I mean North and South America, and the total group of islands which control the approaches to our shores. This would involve a consolidation of North and South America, and experts say, although as a layman I only present their views, and do not myself so urge, the British Isles together with the great bulk of the islands of the Pacific are included. Here, they say, would be at once an impregnable military situation, which could be assaulted from no side without the gravest risk on the part of the attacker. Here would be something almost equally as important—an extension of our frontiers into new vistas, by which our economic system could find a new West for exploitation and development. The tremendous surplus of manufacturing instruments and plants which will exist in America after the war could then be usable in the development of these huge territories. They would not be separate from each other, but would possess a common government, a common army, a common currency, and a common and widely expanded prosperity. Here is a plan worthy of the noble imagination of Americans, interested in a prosperous and safe future.

As an American Senator I feel it is nothing more nor less than my duty to present the plan, as distinguished from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, to my fellow Senators upon this floor.

In a day of rocket guns which can spout deadly projectiles 50 miles into the air and bombard our cities across entire oceans, or of massive attacks which military men assure me can be directed against us over the north polar routes or across the narrow gap of water separating Africa from the hump of Brazil, it is clear there will be no security for any of us in this hemisphere unless there is a true hemispheric unity. What is there so frightening about this noble and entirely reasonable proposal? It offers to all the states and all the persons involved tremendous self-contained markets, direct access to all raw materials required by our humming factories, a higher standard of living to all concerned, and the ultimate in cooperative friendship. Above all, it allows for a real security plan which would effectively prevent anyone from attacking the states of this hemisphere, a plan based upon the true long-term mutuality of outlook which should distinguish the west in its view toward the future.

In my judgment and that also, I believe, of other Members of Congress who have yet to make themselves heard, this plan constitutes the only possible alternative to the failure of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

In his own words, Mr. Ziff's proposals "can lay no claim to perfection. Never-

theless it would mean the taking of a tremendous stride forward on the part of the human race in terms of worldwide social organization and would appear to remove the largest part of the instigation to international crime, by adjusting the world's political divisions to its economic frontiers. The major claim to be made for this design is that it fits in with the premises of the workaday world in a technical age. It presents no obstacle to the efficient operation of the earth's machinery or the use of its resources. Man would be able to take his breath for a new plunge forward into eternal progression."

Today, our present foreign policy seems destined to failure, yet many of the gentlemen who belong to my party have elected to bind themselves to this policy and to this failure.

I do not protest because this is bad party policy alone. I do so because it is also bad Americanism. It is unrealistic, unsound, and uneconomic. It destroys the last vestige of independent thinking in this country, and deprives us of the benefit of that great institution which exists even in monarchial England, where it is referred to as "His Majesty's loyal opposition."

The torch has now been thrown to the younger men of Congress, to men who dare think outside the conventional grooves which the ruling political powers have graven for them.

Those who have held so strongly for an international league propound it as the sole alternative to isolationism. This is a sorry untruth which can only confuse the American people as to the real situation and the real issues.

The proper remedy does not lie in any of these extremes. It lies in an intelligently directed regionalism by which the political organization of the world can be brought into line with economic and social realities.

When Mr. Roosevelt returns from his historic meeting with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin, he must have in his hands a commitment from them by which the issues facing the world can be determined now. We expect him to bring back the bacon if there is anything at all to the mission on which he leaves and the premises on which it is based. He must return to us with more than fair promises and glittering words, for the hour is dangerously late. Either he must possess a mandate to which the other great states have subscribed, and an assurance which can be placed into effect now, or we shall have found ourselves confounded by another Versailles, or perhaps even another Munich. The questions of Poland, Greece, Iran, and all the other dangerous questions now confronting the world, must have some practical resolution in terms of agreement now. We must know now what is intended in reference to the future of Germany or we shall find ourselves at each other's throats finally, debating ideological questions and questions of self-interest, when that piratical state shall come to an end and be occupied by the troops of the United Nations.

If the discussions to be held between the three great leaders of the United Nations are again to result without decision,

if they turn out to be only a mirage of words, then we must resolutely turn our backs on this fantasy of world leagues and world courts. We must find another and more realistic course by which the ultimate security of our hemisphere will be guarded. If necessary, we must utilize to the full the bargaining power granted us by our present military superiority and economic position.

It is futile to turn to the international league soothsayers. Their schemes have been blasted to kingdom come by the actions of the nations themselves, as well as by the inevitable logic of events. We see all of the states reaching out to solidify their own power, with very little reference to the fine pledges made at Dumbarton Oaks.

We note the Russians taking issue with Kent Cooper of the Associated Press, as to what constitutes freedom of the press and alleging that theirs is infinitely superior to ours. In Yugoslavia Britain it is said to have delayed shipment of relief supplies gathered in the United States, an act which is charged with political implications. We note the British, accused of political terrorism in Palestine, acting against the unfortunate Jews, completely oblivious to the opinions of the Mandates Commission of the all but defunct League of Nations, which charged them with turning the mandate upside down. We see Britain acting with a high hand in India and endeavoring to turn the clock back in the various states of western Europe by imposing the rule of monarchial regimes.

In Poland, the Russians are accused of having liquidated the liberal elements, and of destroying those very patriots who fought in the underground for our side against the Germans.

Mr. President, this morning I picked up yesterday's Washington Star, and what did I find? I found an article dealing with Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, sister of the Indian nationalist leader Nehru, who will speak in Washington tonight. What does she say about Dumbarton Oaks? She says:

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals for world security simply repeat old talk about disarmaments and sanctions.

We feel capable of solving our own problems and that we have a right to do it without interference. The complete unanimity demanded by Viceroy Wavell and Prime Minister Churchill as a condition for Indian independence could only be achieved in a dictatorship.

So says the sister of the greatest leader in India next to Gandhi.

I have before me a newspaper article headlined London, January 25, as follows:

Former War Minister Leslie Hore-Belisha said today the Atlantic Charter and Dumbarton Oaks proposals were already "becoming obscured."

We note Lord Woolton, Minister of Reconstruction, urging Britain to undertake a trade war on a big scale and advising his country that they should seek overseas trade "rather than concentrate on filling needs at home." France declares she will never accept foreign inter-

ference or any jurisdiction by a world security organization over her colonies.

Mr. President, that is what France thinks of Dumbarton Oaks. The assurances written in the Atlantic Charter have been disavowed by their very authors under circumstances so tragic as to make all commitments, pledges, and treaties appear worthless.

I have mentioned Britain, Russia, and France, but I must exclude no nation. They are all in the same unhappy position of self-seeking, of attempting to guard their own boundaries and their own future prosperity and security without reference to what may happen to the others.

Must I remind the Senate that these are not events which occurred previous to the Dumbarton Oaks pledges? These are events which have followed Dumbarton Oaks and they are being placed into effect by the cannon and airplanes of our allies and by the inexorable forces of events which are acting without us while our statesmen nobly tilt with the windmills of an international league.

Is it not time that there is inserted in the deliberations of American statesmen a little common sense and a little proper regard for the physical future of Americans? Is it not time that the lives and property of Americans be given some thought in place of this vague set of international pipe-dreams which will be adjudged by history no less silly and no less futile than those which so ingloriously failed when the late and unlamented League of Nations collapsed of its own dead weight?

If there is to be justice, let there be justice for American mothers, for the American taxpayer, and for the American dead whose bodies now rot in foreign soil clear around the globe. If there is to be justice, there must be justice toward all, not only to the struggling states of Europe and Asia but to the dead and wounded, the orphaned, and to the rest of us who now stagger beneath the burden of the most colossal war debt in the history of mankind. If there is to be justice, Mr. President, let there be justice to the millions of unborn, who of right deserve protection against a recurrence of this terrible black night of destructive evil.

Before God, and in the high name of justice, let us determine that this disaster shall not recur again.

Are we to wait forever in this sad valley of delusion called Dumbarton Oaks—wait for still further conferences from which nothing can result; wait for the signing of still more documents, which under analysis will turn out to be as meaningless as those which preceded them? Must our minds remain paralyzed while this is taking place?

We cannot crucify the hopes of mankind upon a cross of phony international legalisms. We cannot continue to remain as we are today, our hands tied, our minds frozen in the psychology of do-nothingism. Everywhere decisions vital to our continued existence are being taken. The decisions by which the post-war world is being formed are being made now. The face of the future world is being hammered into shape by events

and circumstances which we pretend do not exist. And we sit with our hands in the sands of international dope dreams.

Let us put an end to these fantastic dreams of the millennium—dreams which fly into the face of reality. Let us endeavor, in cooperation with our allies, to effect a common-sense reorganization of the globe. In short, let us attempt to place in effect those real measures and opportunities which are open to us and within our power to implement.

Now is the time to act if humankind is to be saved and to be spared another and even more terrifying disaster whose coming is even now discernible.

If in this crisis our eyes are to be blinded by such mirages as those exemplified by Dumbarton Oaks, we shall allow the opportunities for sane and international organization to pass us by. It is we in the Senate who shall have to answer to history for an omission which will be regarded as a crime against the American people, their future, and the future well-being of all mankind.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I regret that more Senators were not in the Chamber to hear the address of the Senator from North Dakota. I do not mean to imply that I agree with him in all his conclusions; but he delivered a thought-provoking and interesting address, and I am glad that I was present to hear it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. It is always a pleasure to hear the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I am glad that he is our neighbor.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR WARTIME CRISES

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I shall not consume much time with the few remarks which I have to make. With the present attendance in the Chamber, I might well ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Record without reading, but I shall be as brief as possible.

In the past several weeks American thinking has been changed by startling and rude events. Almost overnight the people of the United States have been moved from a sense of extreme optimism to one of sober concern by announcements of grave conditions on the war front, on the diplomatic front, and at home.

There was the sudden turn on the battlefields of Europe. Allied leaders—both civil and military—altered their sights to a "long bitter road ahead." The crises and strife in Greece, Poland, Italy, and other liberated countries are serious threats to Allied unity. Disturbing diplomatic controversies have come into the open, and the consequent outbursts of public opinion have severely strained harmony and cooperation.

At home the picture is equally disturbing. Widespread shortages—in war materials, labor, food supplies, and other civilian goods—are revealed by administration officials. The slump in war production brought a sharp crack-down on manpower and the curtailment of civilian production. Agitation is growing for a labor draft and more stringent controls over industrial mobilization. Re-

conversion plans are tossed aside as industry buckles down to military demand. Dwindling stocks of food—"at the lowest point since the war began," according to O. P. A.—led to cancellation of stamps and increased rationing. On every side sober news is reminding the American people "there are still two wars to be won."

Compare this picture with the general climate of opinion generated throughout the country during the summer and late fall. Those were the days when optimism and confidence flew high. Allied armies were winning tremendous victories on every front—there was talk from high quarters of a speedy victory. Winnie and Joe and Frank were the best of friends, with no visible difference to mar the smooth course of their countries' relations. There were comparatively no problems of liberated countries.

At home American labor and industry were highly praised, as they should be, for their superhuman contribution to war production. Civilian restrictions were being eased; rationing was lifted from many products; and the food situation was pictured as growing increasingly better. Plans for reconversion were rapidly going forward—with Government leading the field. War agencies held out hopes of early relaxation of controls. It was an atmosphere of comparative quietude. We almost forgot there was a war.

The momentum of this pleasant state of affairs carried just a little beyond November. Then the sharp reversal set in, which has left our people confused and bewildered. Unable to understand the turn of events, they want to know what happened. What went wrong with the victory that was upon us? What about the plans for reconversion, the stocks of food, war, and civilian materials that were on hand?

The situation calls for a responsible explanation, but before we consider those that have been offered by certain officials of the Government, let us document the conditions which have turned the rosy landscape of last summer into the dark winter now enveloping the situation at home and abroad.

Consider for a moment the public opinion generated from May to November with regard to the home front.

The manpower situation was viewed by officials, with minor exceptions, as satisfactory. Here are a few of the statements:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], in nominating Roosevelt at the July Democratic Convention, said:

Our industry, our labor, our agriculture, our finance, our manpower * * * have all been fused into an irresistible stream whose momentum will drive the war lords of the Nazis and Nipponese back.

President Roosevelt in a speech to the New York State A. F. of L. convention, on August 22, 1944, said:

You deserve and have the gratitude of the American people for the patriotic and outstanding production that you have given to our Army, Navy, and our Merchant Marine which are now winning the war of liberation—a record in production unequalled in the history of this or any other country.

Former Senator TRUMAN, in speaking to the A. F. of L., on September 4, said:

Labor has made a magnificent contribution to the war effort.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] stated on October 3:

He [Roosevelt] has led in organizing our resources for total war—so that we have enough men on the fighting fronts and enough war production to back them up.

True, Army and Navy officials, as well as certain production leaders, in August reported lags, bottlenecks in war production, and labor shortages.

But according to official Washington all was well.

On August 23, 1944, Donald Nelson, testifying before the Truman committee, said that all critical munitions programs, with minor exceptions, were being met, and that war industry could not use more than 100,000 of the 700,000 workers released from munitions production.

Two months later, on October 27, 1944, the President said in a speech at Philadelphia:

Never before in history have the soldiers and sailors of any nation gone into battle so thoroughly supported as the American soldiers and sailors fighting today in Europe, Asia, and the Pacific.

During the summer attention was focused on reconversion and the speedy return to peacetime production.

As early as May, Maury Maverick, head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, was urging priorities to small businesses to increase production of civilian items and thus cushion the ultimate transfer from war to peace production.

On June 18, Donald Nelson, of W. P. B., gave industry the signal to move in the direction of conversion to peacetime production by releasing aluminum and certain surpluses to manufacturers. He said that it is essential to prepare now for the return to civilian production.

In August, W. P. B. lifted its ban on the making of hundreds of items directly beneficial to civilian consumers. Included in the list were vacuum cleaners, ranges, washtubs, egg beaters, lawn mowers, and sewing machines.

On September 7, 1944, Mr. James Byrnes filed a report on reconversion providing for a 40 percent cut in war production on VE-day. It promised a relaxation of controls to permit manufacturers a freedom in planning for the resumption of civilian production and a speedy return to civilian production.

October 12 brought the announcement by W. P. B. that it planned to ease the curb on farm machinery production.

A visit was paid by Edward J. Kaiser on October 19 to the White House, where he presented an immediate specific pattern for reconversion, which he said he and other manufacturers could carry into operation right away. According to Mr. Kaiser, the President was tremendously impressed, and official Washington spoke this wise:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in July:

Already we are preparing for the return of our national economy to the practices and conditions of peace.

Candidate Roosevelt on September 23, 1944:

We are even now organizing the logistics of the peace just as Marshall, King, Arnold are organizing the logistics of this war.

Early in the spring O. P. A. provided ration-book holders a breathing spell. Many point values were reduced and some foods were removed completely from the list. In September larger amounts of food—some point-free—were placed at the disposal of housewives.

Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration, in a letter to Chester Bowles, of O. P. A., said:

It is our view that there are ample and prospective supplies of these products to justify removing them from the ration list.

This was on August 31, 1944.

War Mobilizer Byrnes said of this action:

The release of the rationing restrictions on these foods has been made possible by the magnificent production job done by our farmers and by the processors of food. The War Food Administration, under the able direction of Marvin Jones, is to be congratulated on its accomplishments. The action now announced is in accord with the policy of Government to lift wartime restrictions as quickly as possible. When the supply of other foods make possible their removal from the ration list they will be promptly removed.

In harmony with the rosy picture at home, all was calm and confident on the war and diplomatic fronts during the summer. Civil as well as military leaders were of the opinion that the Germans were tottering and practically knocked out. Campaign speeches dripped with this optimism.

Former Senator TRUMAN declared on August 31, 1944:

Victory is now in sight.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] joined in the chorus on October 3, 1944, with:

Now that Germany is nearly smashed * * *

The President said on October 27, 1944:

The war in Europe has reached the final, decisive phase.

The problems of international peace were to be solved easily and smoothly by the personal friendship of three men, by the Atlantic Charter, and the Four Freedoms.

Former Senator TRUMAN said on August 31, 1944:

Under his (Roosevelt's) leadership we have met one crisis after another, in peace and war. Our President has worked with these men during these trying years. He talks their language—the language of nations. He knows the reasons which govern their decisions. At no time in our history has a President possessed such knowledge of foreign leaders and their problems. None has ever so completely won their confidence and admiration.

Mr. Roosevelt said on October 22, 1944:

We have achieved a very practical expression of a common purpose on the part of four great nations, who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on a greater and more difficult enterprise—that of waging the peace—com-

mitted to trust in each other, work together as we have done so closely, so harmoniously and effectively in the fighting of the war and, at the same time, in the building of the peace.

James F. Byrnes said on October 30, 1944:

The four leaders have achieved a unity that was considered impossible in the last war, and informed persons know their success has been due in great measure to the patience, tact, and balanced judgment of the President.

Mr. Roosevelt said on November 2, 1944:

I have spent many fruitful hours talking with men from the more remote nations * * * all of them are part and parcel of the great family of nations. It is only through an understanding acquired by years of consultation that one can get a viewpoint of their problems and their innate yearning for freedom.

All was well on the diplomatic front. War nerves had been quieted. Harmony united the Big Three. Power politics was nowhere to be seen. The future was bright and glorious.

And yet, underlying that situation, as with the manpower, production, and food situations at home, there were some ugly facts, as we now know; but the comforting blanket of optimism and tranquillity had been smoothly drawn over them.

Nothing was allowed to mar this picture at home and abroad until after November. Then rapidly and progressively the veneer was torn away and the facts began to show up.

Early in December W. P. B. Chairman J. A. Krug told of serious shortages in critical materials. Speaking at a meeting of the N. A. M., he said, "40 percent of our war production is lagging," and he called upon industry to man the plants to the fullest. Mr. Krug, James Forrestal, Robert Patterson, and Paul McNutt called for more labor for war production by the application of employment ceilings and priority controls, with no civilian production if it would require labor needed for the war program.

On January 1, 1945, James F. Byrnes vigorously demanded a tightening of selective service, cancellation of priority and allocation rights for nonwar plants, suspension of racing, compulsory service for IV-F's, and strengthening of W. L. B. enforcement powers. He said:

We must direct our efforts to channeling this released manpower into critical war programs and industries needed to support them.

All along the line the post-election outlook on the production front quickly lost its previous note of confidence. In December General Somervell told of critical shortages, and gave little hope of relaxation to industry, even upon the fall of Germany.

On December 16, W. P. B. froze civilian-goods production at current levels, and blocked its own earlier plans for expansion of civilian production in 1945. All reconversion plans were stopped cold.

On January 18, 1945, W. P. B. Chairman Krug announced that industrial alcohol and aluminum were back on the crucial list and that sheet aluminum production was 50,000,000 pounds below

requirements. Inventories of metals are the lowest since 1942.

Philip Wilson, W. P. B. vice chairman for metals and minerals, said that the Army Air Forces' plan to furlough enlisted men to work in aluminum mills would help fill the need for 5,000 additional workers.

And so production, which had reached miracle proportions in the summer and was to be geared to reconversion, was tightened all along the line.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. One of the great aluminum mills in my State of Oregon was closed down because of what was said to be an overproduction of aluminum. However, a considerable amount of the taxpayers' money was spent in building a great aluminum plant in Canada. Am I to understand that the Senator has evidence that there is now a shortage of aluminum?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have been quoting from Mr. Krug, who announced that aluminum and alcohol had been returned to the crucial list. I thank the Senator for his valuable contribution.

The food situation grew suddenly darker in December. Controls were clamped back on and rationing tightened. According to Price Administrator Bowles, "supplies of commercially canned fruit have been short for several months" and civilian supplies are "at the lowest point since the war began." Mr. Bowles now ruefully admits that there was an error in judgment.

In his message to the Congress, on January 6, 1945, the President called for "the total mobilization of all our human resources for the prosecution of the war."

Selective service now demands more recruits. The President also said:

The Selective Service Act should be amended to provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces. The need is too pressing to await the outcome of further efforts at recruiting.

It has since developed that the shortage of nurses was known all summer.

The forces that seemed to lay calm and unperturbed on the diplomatic scene through the summer months have since exploded with disruptive fury. The Atlantic Charter was only scribbled notes. It now develops that the Big Three have not seen eye to eye for many months with respect to a great number of extremely crucial situations.

The clashes between British, Russian, and American foreign policies were touched off by the situation in Italy, when Britain virtually vetoed Count Sforza as Italian Foreign Minister. Then came unrest in Belgium, which was put down by British soldiers. The political turmoil in Greece was like a stick of dynamite; one touch and allied harmony was badly shattered. The upheavals in Poland have driven sharp wedges into international peace. Each one of those crises indicates that grave differences exist between the major powers on the basis of future international peace.

Forgetful perhaps of last summer's rosy outlook and harmony between the Big Three, President Roosevelt said in his message of January 6, 1945:

Perfectionism may obstruct the paths to international peace . . . the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of this war-torn world's tangled situations.

War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes said on January 1, 1945:

We have already made one too early start toward reconversion. During the spring and summer a wave of optimism swept the United States and our allies. We had to undo what had been done on reconversion.

This, then, is the story as explained by official sources: One, that an unforeseen resurgence of the Nazi war machine is the cause of our present difficulties; and, two, a charge that the American people were responsible for a premature optimism—a relaxation and let-down in the war effort. By this explanation it is sought to fasten our current troubles on two conditions seemingly outside official control, but the explanation does not explain. There are too many questions unanswered, and there is still an accounting to be made.

If optimism—false and ill-based as it is said to be by many high officials—brought about the present state of affairs, there must have been something radically wrong last summer. Optimism does not spring forth native from the soil. It is a quality which responds most to cultivation. The important question is, Was the optimism of last summer and fall affirmatively fostered; and if so, by whom?

Our people have been ready at all times to follow honest and courageous leadership. They know well that a war must be won; and they need only to be told plainly what is required of them. But how can our people be otherwise than confused when the Government itself gives them a mixture of unfounded optimism, conflicting statements, and concealment of important and bitter facts within the sugar-coated pill? How can our people know what is required of them when their Government blows hot and then cold?

First, we were led to believe by the declarations of high Government authority that the war was almost over, and barely 2 months later we are being grimly reminded that there are two wars to be won. Industry was given the go-ahead on plans for peacetime reconversion, and when it was halfway through the intersection the red light flashed it to a halt. At one moment labor is praised to the heavens for the superb job which workers have done, only shortly thereafter to be reprimanded for slacking on the job. Amid assurances of ample supplies, ration restrictions are removed from consumer goods, but barely do we adjust ourselves to point-free shopping when new and more drastic controls are imposed.

Is this change in the fortunes of war the real cause for the crack-downs now sought to be imposed?

The answer to that question is a simple one. Reverses are always to be expected in war. And when they come they compel greater efforts behind the battle lines and on the home front. But can we use the Nazi break-through in December as an excuse for the present crack-downs? On the contrary, it is quite possible to say that the military reverses in December were aggravated by the failure last summer to do those things which would have strengthened the military later in its hour of need.

The Administration cannot escape the consequences of its own actions. It cannot squirm out of the stubborn logic of events. Last summer the administration took credit for the military victories as a brilliant testimonial to the Commander in Chief. It was then that they boasted of abundant supplies of men and equipment. It was then that they spoke of production miracles. Administration spokesmen breathed the heavy optimism that Germany was finished, and the war just about over. Administration agencies fostered the talk of reconversion. The administration cultivated the optimism.

How strange it is, too, that the political confusion and controversy in Europe did not come out into the open until after November? The Greek situation had been rumbling beneath the surface for months, but no real information about it was permitted to jar the notes of harmony piped to us before November.

A similar controversy enveloped the Polish situation. The deadlock between British-supported Poles in London and Soviet-inspired Poles in Lublin existed all summer—in fact, ever since the Russians had stopped before Warsaw, sacrificing the Polish underground forces in that city.

In Italy conditions had been openly growing worse for months, but this, too, remained in the shadows of hushed diplomacy.

Why were production, manpower, and rationing controls relaxed from May to November? The people were not responsible for the wave of optimism—they were deceived by it and they are now the victims of it.

On January 1, 1945, in expiation, Mr. Byrnes declared that glowing prophecies will no longer be heard until they are sound. The administration made those prophecies—and Mr. Byrnes' statement is the clearest and most damaging admission that the country was misled by false prophecies.

If the manpower situation is now critical, the administration's tactics are responsible. Let me show by a simple piece of evidence how true this is. In a sincere and revealing letter to former Senator TRUMAN, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1945, on page 149, the vice president of the Beech Aircraft Corporation, which has an excellent production and labor record, declared:

During the months of October and the early part of November we experienced great difficulty in retaining our working force at a constant level. . . . We consider that this was an entirely natural development which was caused directly by the overoptimistic statements made by many of the most

prominent individuals in positions of high authority among the Allied Nations, with regard to early termination of the European War. The public press at that time carried almost nothing but statements about post-war reconversion, cancelation of contracts, termination, cut-backs, and post-war planning. The Government officially acted through its various agencies to continually warn the manufacturer of these factors and to prepare him for these anticipated events.

It is no wonder that this strong emphasis . . . should have produced the result which it did produce, that of inducing people to leave war industries to seek peacetime jobs. The reaction was entirely normal for people with American traditions of self-reliance.

Similar evidence can be produced to show that the production let-down and the present gravity of the food and supply situation stem from the same tactics.

Here, then, is the pattern. From May to November we have glowing accounts of military victories, predictions of early peace, eulogies of harmony and unity between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, paeans of praise for the Commander in Chief, and a love feast over production miracles, manpower surpluses, and foods too plentiful for rationing.

But after November everything is wrong. This pattern does not happen by chance. It is too obvious to require an explanation. Either failure in planning or gross ignorance of conditions by those who should know better, are alone to blame. Production, manpower and food shortages do not appear overnight. When they come—as they did in December—they reflect conditions of 6 months earlier.

And now to retrieve the consequences of such mismanagement, the controls are being tightened, as though manufacturers, workers, farmers, the boys whose physical defects kept them out of the armed forces, and all the rest of us, were the ones responsible for the let down.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank those of my Republican colleagues who are present for being so patient as to remain until this late hour to listen to a few remarks I shall make this afternoon on a matter which I believe to be of extreme importance to the people of the United States. I also wish to thank the Acting Majority Leader for his patience and indulgence in waiting to this late hour.

Mr. President, within a few short weeks there will be held in the city of Mexico a very important continental conference, at which there will be present representatives of the various nations of the Western Hemisphere, to discuss matters which, in my opinion, will be of more importance to the United States than even the matters which have been discussed this afternoon by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that the interest of the United States, as a post-war proposition, will be within the continents of the Western Hemisphere, and it is with reference to that particular hemisphere, that I beg the indulgence of the Senators who are now present while I make a few brief remarks.

More than 135 years ago—in 1810, to be exact—distinguished citizens of Chile ventured the idea of a confederation of states embracing all the countries of Spanish America, and in the following year declared themselves in favor of an alliance of all American nations. In 1818 the Argentinean, San Martin, and the Chilean, Bernardo O'Higgins, looked forward to the formulation of some sort of a continental plan of unity. The great Simon Bolivar, the George Washington of Spanish America and the creator of five republics, brought together, in the city of Panama, in 1826, the delegates of the American republics, and in so doing he gave expression to the fraternal aspirations of a goodly part of the Western Hemisphere. The flame of pan-Americanism was periodically rekindled by Peru from 1846 to 1864, and it can be said that the United States of North America did not hold itself aloof from this continental ideal from the very beginning.

From the most humble efforts, apparently fruitless, the ideal of a genuine inter-Americanism is today emerging triumphant, for with the passing of years since the struggles for political independence, this ideal has not faded into the oblivion of idle dreams, but, on the contrary, new personalities have appeared on the American scene to carry forward with honesty, sincerity, intelligence, and enthusiasm the torch of pan-Americanism, and to champion the principle of the equality of American states and their absolute rights and privileges as sovereign and independent nations.

From its inception the ideal of pan-Americanism has emphasized the absolute equality of American states, and this regardless of territorial extent, population, economic wealth, or military strength. These guiding tenets of inter-American relations reached their summit of expression at the Eighth International Conference of American States held at Lima, Peru, in 1938, when our Secretary of State, the beloved Cordell Hull, was moved to observe that "in our Conference we have demonstrated our unshakable determination to respect the integrity of individuals and of states, to uphold the sanctity of the pledged word, and to make needed changes through the orderly process of consultation in a spirit of mutual accommodation."

Let us not speak today of the many set-backs suffered by the inter-American ideal throughout the Americas and throughout the years, for the time has come to center our attentions and efforts upon every possibility which will bring the republics of the Western Hemisphere into a closer union. In order fully to comprehend the practical reasons which should impel us to nurture more intensive and extensive relations with Latin America, it is necessary to penetrate into the economic field, and to examine, even though superficially, the tremendous contribution of this area to the present war effort of the United Nations.

The Latin-American republics are predominantly agricultural, although they are indeed the sources of important mineral products. These republics are only moderately industrialized, and are de-

pendent upon imports of manufacturers and semimanufacturers for the maintenance of their light peacetime industries, transportation, and consumer goods. Therefore, their normal trade with the United States is largely the exchange of raw materials for manufactured goods.

The United States, self-sufficient in many agricultural products but deficient in certain strategic materials for its manufacturing industries, is now a major importer of all Latin-American minerals, and these products can be added to sugar, coffee, hides, and skins, which have been major import items during years of peace. Fibers and crude rubber will be accorded high priority positions until supplies are again available from far-eastern sources. Wartime needs and the disruption of normal trade channels have accentuated the essential requirements of the United States and of the Latin-American republics, and the trade between them since 1940 has reflected the measure of this dependence and the ability of each to serve the other. The United States has released manufactures to maintain their national economies, together with such special equipment as will aid the various countries in expanding operations in those fields of production which are important to the United States for the prosecution of the war.

The same needs are bringing about such improvements in manufacturing technique and in the substitution of less strategic materials and synthetic products by the American manufacturers and such a desire for industrialization by the Latin-American republics that it is quite possible that the nature of the present interdependence may be modified during the next decade. Nevertheless, it has been fully demonstrated that the resources of the Latin-American republics are of inestimable value and that it would be most unfortunate if the United States did not have full access to them.

To mention one very critical material, the case of copper affords an excellent example of the importance of the Latin-American field. Although the United States long has been the leading country in the production of refined copper, economic conditions indicate that this will not continue to be the case many more years, because, first, our domestic copper reserves are being rapidly depleted, which in turn is associated with higher costs of producing copper; second, no new fields of copper ore have been discovered recently in the United States; and third, other countries, particularly Central and South Africa, and Chile have large fields of high-grade copper ores which can be processed very cheaply. The United States has dropped already from first to third place in copper exports during the last decade. Our less favorable copper ore situation is further indicated by the fact that the average percentage of copper in our ores has dropped from 1.41 percent in 1929 to approximately 1.10 percent in 1941, according to the United States Bureau of Mines. Estimates by various metallurgists as given in a report by the United States Tariff Commission as of January 1, 1944, indicate that there are available approximately 24,000,000 tons of copper reserves

in the United States. Our post-war annual consumption has been estimated by the Director of the American Bureau of Metal Statistics, at 850,000 short tons of new copper. If this amount were produced annually, it would lead to a depletion of our known reserves at the end of the next 25 or 30 years. Unquestionably our Latin-American neighbors can assist us not only in conserving our copper reserves, but also in building up a stock pile. Various metallurgists, according to the American Mining and Metallurgical Engineers Report of 1937, have estimated that the Latin-American countries have reserves of at least 30,000,000 short tons of copper. Of this amount 28,000,000 short tons are estimated to be in Chile, and of this 95 percent is controlled by American capital.

With appropriate modifications, the same story can be related with reference to Latin America and the supply of such critical materials as tin, petroleum, quartz, fiber, cinchona (quinine), rubber, and many others.

As stated before, the economy of the Latin-American countries, considered as a whole, is predominantly agricultural. The transition to an industrial economy is hampered by both material and cultural factors. Among the first, we need mention only a scarcity of coal and oil, poor location of mining of the available mineral resources, inadequate transportation facilities due especially to topographic conditions, and scarcity of capital, equipment and technicians. Of the less tangible influences, probably the most important are an indifference to material gain and progress as these are conceived in industrial countries, and the relative absence of a business spirit and a spirit of enterprise among the wealthier and more influential classes. Widespread poverty and lack of purchasing power among the great bulk of the population is a major barrier to extensive industrialization.

Foremost among the factors favoring industrial growth are a wide variety of rich mineral, forest, and agricultural resources and abundant potential supplies of hydroelectric power. To these must be added a growing population, an awakened national consciousness, a rising spirit of business enterprise, and favorable governmental policies. In their desire to achieve greater economic stability and independence, and to raise the standard of living of the masses through a more balanced economy, the governments of the more progressive Latin-American countries have adopted extensive programs for the aid and encouragement of manufactures. More recently the United States, in pursuance of its good neighbor policy and its war production program, has done much to further this development. Finally, newer technical developments in the field of the chemical industries, electric power and air transportations appear likely to free Latin-American industry from some of the handicaps under which it has labored in the past.

It is important to know also that the present war crisis has both stimulated and hampered the growth of manufacturing in Latin-America. The indus-

tries chiefly to benefit have been those relying on domestic raw materials and producing for general consumption, such as textiles. The extreme scarcity of shipping, combined with Allied restrictions upon exports, has reduced customary supplies not only of finished manufactures but also of much needed machinery and indispensable materials from abroad. Although the activities of some manufacturing industries have been curtailed as a result of these conditions, on the whole there have been substantial increases in production in the war years, both to meet domestic needs and in some important instances, to supply a rising export trade to other Latin-American countries and even to the Allied Nations. It is clear that the effect of the present global war has been greatly to accelerate the trend toward industrialization in Latin-America. While some painful readjustments will come at the end of the present war boom, manufacturing will undoubtedly resume its peace time course on a higher level than in the pre-war years.

From the viewpoints of both Latin America and the United States, the requirements of hemisphere defense call for a far greater degree of industrialization in our sister republics to the south than prevailed at the opening of the present conflict.

Thus it is, that of all the projects and plans, of all the schemes and aspirations, receiving the attention of our Government during these tense and perilous times, there is none which, from both a practical and idealistic point of view, calls for more sincerity and earnestness of effort in the post-war period than the stimulation of the good-neighbor policy among, and the establishment of a united front by the nations of the Americas. But let us be realistic about these matters. In my opinion the success of pan-Americanism should not, for it cannot, depend exclusively upon the cold and calculated aspects of the mutual material benefits to be derived therefrom. True, pan-Americanism must build its foundations, not only upon the granite of pragmatic considerations, but also upon the marble of cultural respect and understanding. We can learn much from the literatures and arts of our neighbors, and it is to the authors and creators of these, the real lasting values of a people, that we must go if we are justly to appraise the less tangible, but certainly the most workable key to mutual good will and successful intercourse.

It does not require superior sagacity to understand the sensibility of the pan-American ideal; and the only reason why the movement had to await an international crisis to receive any real attention from our Government is simply the almost complete lack of interest in or knowledge of Latin America on the part of our citizenry and leaders alike since the birth of the Republic. It has often been stated that the lack of a considerable group of informed citizens may become a real danger, particularly in a country like the United States where foreign policy is based largely on public opinion; at least, this has been so during the greater part of our history. The

sad truth is that such a lack does exist at the present time in the United States with reference to Latin America. We talk about Russia, England, France, and other countries. After the war our interest should be south of the border. The real irony of the situation lies in the lack of knowledge on the part of the American people with respect to Latin-American affairs, and the little interest, apparently, they have in Latin America. To be sure, there have always existed small groups of thinking citizens who made every effort to nurture pan-American relations, but even in university and governmental circles their voices were too weak to be heard above the din of other issues, perhaps far less important. The present world crisis has brought into focus not only the desirability of practical pan-Americanism, but also the need for such a scheme if we are to witness the healthy operation of plans for hemispheric solidarity.

In discussing the general features of the good-will policy toward Latin America, naturally I have dealt in generalities. However, in order to appreciate the problems involved, I only have to call attention to one specific matter, and that is the treaty now before the Senate, made by this country with the Republic of Mexico, involving the distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers. That treaty was agreed to between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, through consultation between, and the advice of, the State Department of this country and the Office of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Mexico.

In my opinion, the policy of good will between the two countries was certainly attended to in considering this convention. No one would accuse the Honorable Cordell Hull, until lately Secretary of State for this country, of not being a patriotic and loyal American, and of not protecting American rights in an equitable and just way, or of being in favor of giving away American rights that should be protected. I have always maintained that the greatest characteristic of the American people is its emphasis of fair play. In arriving at the agreements of the convention between Mexico and this country on the distribution of the waters indicated, I firmly believe that the State Department took full care of the rights involved.

Everyone knows that in coming to any kind of an agreement, a spirit of give-and-take is necessary. We know that the water reserved for the citizens of Texas in the treaty are derived from the Mexican side of the border. Hence, it appears only fair that in dealing with a foreign country this country should also be fair. But there are in this country individuals—few, thank goodness—who would want Mexico to provide all the waters for the necessities of Texas, but at the same time would be unwilling to do something for the Republic of Mexico. There are people in this country who feel that only our rights should be protected.

If we are to have good will, we also must entertain some respect for the rights of other governments. Also, I have always maintained that the Republic of

Mexico is the key to our standing in Latin America. If we do not treat that Republic in a fair way, following just and equitable principles, what are the other countries south of Mexico to say? If we do not treat our nearest neighbor justly, what are they to expect?

By the kindness of the people of New Mexico, I happen to represent that State in this august body. No one knows better than do the people of New Mexico that most of my time is devoted to their interests; and in this instance, I feel that the treaty now being considered by this body takes care of New Mexico's interest, and at the same time indicates to the world at large that we in New Mexico are not motivated only by selfish interests in dealing with a friendly foreign nation.

I consider it imperative to add my voice to that of those Americans throughout the hemisphere who zealously support the principle of inter-American unity, toward the end that the establishment of a sincerely conceived plan of action will be an actuality, and that this plan be perpetuated for the mutual benefit of all the Americas in every field of human relations after we have effected the peace which we so anxiously await.

REPORT BY ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD ON STRATEGIC MATERIALS (S. DOC. No. 5)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested in the address of the Senator from New Mexico, and especially in that part of it which concerns the strategic and critical materials which the United States has been receiving from Latin America during the present war. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report made by the Army and Navy Munitions Board and submitted to the Senate on January 6.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF LESLIE L. BIFFLE AS ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 63), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Leslie L. Biffle be, and he is hereby, appointed Acting Secretary of the Senate, and that said Acting Secretary be, and he is hereby, empowered to do and perform all official acts pertaining to the Office of Secretary of the Senate not specifically devolved on the Secretary by law, and under the same responsibilities now devolved on the Secretary; that he so continue during the further order of the Senate, and that the salary of the said Leslie L. Biffle be continued the same as now received by him as the Secretary to the majority of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the Acting Secretary of the Senate may take the oath of office.

There being no objection, Mr. Leslie L. Biffle advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 65), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the appointment of Leslie L. Biffle as Acting Secretary of the Senate.

FLORAL WREATH FOR THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

On motion by Mr. BYRD, it was

Ordered, That the Acting Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to purchase a floral wreath on the occasion of the funeral of the late Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, the cost thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

POEM IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be printed a poem written in tribute to Colonel Halsey by Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWIN A. HALSEY

E-very Member of the Senate
D-own unto the smallest page,
W-onders why dear Colonel Halsey,
I-n the flower of his age,
N-ow, at such a time, should die,

A-nd bid them the last goodbye.

H-e, a friend to everybody,
A-lways ready to help, stood
L-ooking for a chance to render
S-ome assistance, when he could.
E-ven down unto the end;
Y-ea, he proved a ready friend.

F-ar and near, Ed Halsey's praises
R-ightly will for years be sung,
I-nside and outside the Senate,
E-verywhere, the old and young,
N-ow, in their deep sorrow sing,
"D-eath, O Death! how sharp they sting!"

I-n this hour's grievous sorrow,
N-one can soothe, but God alone.
D-eath's the dawn of faith's tomorrow
E-ver God cares for his own.
E-ven in Christ's latest breath,
D-id He triumph over death.

—Horace C. Carlisle.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Vincent R. Murphy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for

temporary service, to rank from April 11, 1943;

Several officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade);

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign;

Lieut. Charles H. Kretz, Junior, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant;

Several ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign;

Ensign James V. Bartlett, D-V (s), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade);

Several ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign; and

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as I must leave the Chamber, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have a nomination on the Executive Calendar confirmed. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of H. Struve Hensel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Struve Hensel of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there are also on the Calendar five other nominations in the Navy. The first is that of Frederick J. Horne, a very distinguished officer, to be admiral, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations. There are also a number of nominations in the Marine Corps. I ask unanimous consent that all these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Navy and Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER NOMINATION RECOMMENDED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Myrtus P. Spangenberg to be postmaster at Waymart, Pa., which nomination previously had been passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that, without objection, at the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the nomination will be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of T. Hoyt Davis, of Georgia, to be

United States district judge for the middle district of Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William M. Payne to be postmaster at Natchitoches, La.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

DEATH OF EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I offer resolutions, and I request unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 66) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Col. Edwin A. Halsey, late the Secretary of the Senate.

Resolved, That the Acting Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Secretary of the Senate, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Wallace Murray, of Ohio, now Director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Herman B. Baruch, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Sydney, Australia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

H. Struve Hensel to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

T. Hoyt Davis to be United States district judge for the middle district of Georgia.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Frederick J. Horne to be an admiral, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

Frank G. Fahrion to be a rear admiral, to rank from February 21, 1943.

Marshall R. Greer to be a rear admiral, to rank from August 28, 1943.

Peter K. Fischler to be a rear admiral, to rank from May 11, 1943.

Thomas P. Jeter to be a commodore, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Battleship Squadron 2, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from October 20, 1944.

IN THE MARINE CORPS TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Jack C. Scott
William H. Whitaker
John B. Bertelling
Elmer P. Thompson, Jr.
Robert R. Read
Albert L. Clark
Stanley V. Titterud
Warren H. Keck
George W. Bubb
George W. Carrington, Jr.
William F. Lane
Andrew S. Farago
Albert E. Leonard
Francis J. Stutler
Roland A. Marbaugh
Donald F. Dickey
Charles B. Spradley
James E. Garner
Ernest B. Ford
Richard M. Bickford
Ira Goldberg

POSTMASTER

LOUISIANA

William M. Payne, Natchitoches.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, unto us have been committed heavy responsibilities; be ever present here, for it is so difficult for us to be always wise and strong. In all ways qualify us for excellent service and grant that we may realize the sanctity of politics. Help us to combat the aggressions of the strong against the weak and the rich against the poor. O draw us nearer to Thee as we say to our souls: "Oh, for a man to rise in me, that the man I am may cease to be."

Holy Spirit, we pray for the constant presence of Thy wise guidance; under the spell of big horizons, broaden us with a self-revising estimate of our enlarging outlook. Grant that our dominant strength may not pale in defending the standards of an ever-changing world. Back of the tragic unrest of the suffering and appealing multitudes in the pathways of war, speak, Almighty God, first to the life of each human being, then to the larger life of our Nation, and then to the vaster life of humanity. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced

that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation, which was read:

JANUARY 26, 1945.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress,
Seventh Congressional District, Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 24, 1945.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Virginia my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Third District of Virginia, to become effective February 15, 1945.

Yours sincerely,

DAVE SATTERFIELD, Jr.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 25, 1945.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on January 17, 1945, elect JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, and DANIEL A. REED, of New York, to be members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to fill vacancies caused by the retirement of Wesley E. Disney, of Oklahoma, and Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts, and to serve with the following other House members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of such joint committee: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON of North Carolina; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota.

Respectfully yours,

R. L. DOUGHTON, Chairman.

DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. BLOOM, New York; Mr. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public